2045

THE

EASTERN ORIGIN

OF THE

CELTIC NATIONS

PROVED BY A COMPARISON OF

THEIR DIALECTS

WITH THE

SANSKRIT, GREEK, LATIN, AND TEUTONIC
LANGUAGES:

FORMING A SUPPLEMENT TO RESEARCHES INTO THE PHYSICAL
HISTORY OF MANKIND.

BY

JAMES COWLES PRICHARD, M.D., F.R.S.,
ETC.

EDITED BY

R. G. LATHAM, M.A., M.D., F.R.S.,
ETC.

TO

THE REVEREND

WILLIAM DANIEL CONYBEARE, A.M., F.R.S., ETC.,

RECTOR OF SULLY,

AND TO

PROFESSOR JACOB GRIMM,

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF GOETTINGEN,

THIS WORK IS INSCRIBED,

IN TESTIMONY OF

THE HIGH RESPECT AND REGARD

OF

THE AUTHOR.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

WHEN the publisher of the present edition, after stating the extent to which Dr. Prichard's Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations was a work which still kept up the interest and importance which it had at the time of its publication, added the request that I would undertake the Editorship of a reprint, the first question I asked was why he had preferred an investigator in general ethnology and philology to a special Keltic scholar, either Welsh or Irish; remarking, at the same time, that there were many to be found who were, doubtless, both able and willing to undertake the required editorship? Even if these were wanting, Sanskrit scholars, familiar with comparative philology, would be fitter editors than myself; these being, at least, as abundant as the others; and the Sanskrit language being, in the book itself, of equal prominence and importance with the Keltic.

His answer was that this had been already con-
sidered; but that the decidedly ethnological cha-
racter of the work had convinced him that a minute
criticism of its details was less wanted than a
broad view of its principles, and leading statements;
and that an investigator, who was neither Kelt nor
Sanskrit, but general, was more likely to do justice
to the work than a special scholar.

I thought then, as I think now, that this view
was sound, and undertook the responsibility of
editing one of the most important contributions ever
made to philological ethnography. A great deal
of the Supplementary Chapter (pp. 65—159) was
already written, the criticism of the so-called Keltic
migrations having long been a matter upon which I
had employed myself; indeed, the publication of all
the notices of ancient writers upon the ancient
Kelts, with a body of ethnological notes, after the
manner of my edition of the Germania of Tacitus,
had, for some years, been contemplated by me.

Again, the volume of Prichard is not merely an
exposition of the reasons which induced the Author
to make the Keltic tongues Indo-European, but a
general explanation of the meaning of that term,
founded upon a remarkably clear exposition of the

nature and relations of the languages which consti-
tute the group. It is more than this. It is an
excellent introduction to ethnology in general;
inferior to no work on the same subject except Dr.
Prichard's own larger ones. Over these even it has
the advantage of brevity and conciseness.

But that heavy objections (in the mind, at least,
of the editor) lie against the ordinary doctrine
suggested by the term Indo-European, may be seen
in almost every page of the annotations. They lie,
however, less against the work under notice than
against current opinion in general. It is possible
that this may be correct; and, if so, my own views
are exceptionable. I do not say that they are not
so. I only say that, if the current views concerning
what is called the Eastern origin of the so-called
Indo-Europeans are correct, they are so by accident;
for they rest upon an amount of assumption far
greater than what the nature of the question either
requires or allows.

It only remains to be added, that this edition
of Dr. Prichard's 'Eastern Origin of the Celtic
Nations,' is published with the special sanction
of the proprietors of the copyright.

ADVERTISEMENT.

═══

THE treatise now laid before the public forms
a Supplement to my Researches into the Physical
History of Mankind, and was announced in the
first edition of that work, which was printed in
1813. Of the motives which induced me so long
to withhold it, and of those which have at length
determined me to the publication, a sufficient ac-
count will be found in the Introduction; and I have
only a few words to premise on the circumstances
and designation under which the work now appears.

It is termed, a Supplement to Researches into
the Physical History of Mankind, because it was
undertaken with the view of furnishing proofs of a
series of facts, of which little more could be intro-
duced into that work than general statements, con-
taining the results of inquiries which had been
sufficient for my own conviction. It forms, how-
ever, a distinct treatise, in exclusion of its reference

to the history of nations or races of men; and it
may be proper to remark that some of the philo-
logical researches which it contains have been pur-
sued into greater extent than the primary object of
the work may seem to have required. If this is in
one respect a fault, it may be hoped that contingent
advantages in another point of view will be found
to atone for it. The examination of cognate lan-
guages, while it points out their resemblances, and
proves the affinity of the races of men of which
they formed the vernacular speech, seldom fails at
the same time to elucidate, in a greater or less
degree the structure of the respective idioms them-
selves; and it will appear, if I am not mistaken,
that the relation of the Celtic dialects to the other
languages brought into comparison with them, fur-
nishes the means of throwing some light on the
European idioms in general. I have followed the
investigation which thus suggested itself, and have
stated the results. If the latter are well established,
they will be found both interesting by themselves to
the philologist, and will, at the same time, strongly
confirm the principal inferences obtained in respect
to the origin and mutual affinity of the European
nations.

As I have had occasion in several parts of this treatise to allude to the grammatical forms of some languages, with which I am but imperfectly acquainted, I have endeavoured to cite correctly the authorities on which I have depended for information. The names of various grammarians and other writers on philological subjects, with the designations of their works, will be found in the marginal references [foot notes] scattered through the following pages, and need not be mentioned in this place. But there are four living authors to whom, in a more especial manner, I am indebted, and am anxious to acknowledge my obligation. These are Mr. H. H. Wilson, the learned secretary of the Asiatic Society, author of the Sanskrit dictionary, and Professors Bopp, Rosen, and Grimm, to whose well known works I have made, throughout this essay, frequent references.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER.

The Keltic Nations of Antiquity.

CHAPTER I.

Preliminary survey of the forms of words and the permutations of letters.

CHAPTER II.

Further proofs and extension of the observations laid down in the preceding chapter.

CHAPTER III.

Proofs of common origin in the vocabulary of the Celtic and other Indo-European languages.

CHAPTER IV.

Proofs of a common origin derived from the grammatical structure of the Celtic and other Indo-European languages.

CHAPTER V.

Of the personal pronouns in the Indo-European languages, and of the derivation of the personal endings of verbs.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the inflections of Verbs through tenses and moods.

CHAPTER VII.

*Illustration of the principles developed in the preceding chapter—
Conjugations of the verb substantive, and of attributive verbs,
both in other Indo-European languages and in the Celtic
dialects.*

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER.

INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I.

Different opinions respecting the population of the world—Autochthones—
  Hypothesis of the ancients—Modern opinion—Way of investigating
  the subject—Physical evidence—Comparison of languages—How far
  this inquiry has tended to elucidate the history of nations—General
  relations and value of philological inquiries.

MANY writers on natural history and geography
have maintained the opinion that each particular
region of the earth must have been supplied from
the beginning, by a separate and distinct creation,
with its peculiar stock of indigenous or native inha-
bitants. Among the ancients this notion prevailed
almost universally. There existed, indeed, in the
pagan world an obscure tradition of a primitive pair
fashioned out of clay by the hand of Prometheus or
of Jupiter ; but this belonged to mythology; which,
in its literal sense, at least, was of little authority
with the best informed, and the frequent occurrence
of such terms as *autochthones, indigenæ,* or *abori-
ginal inhabitants,* whenever reference is made to the
population of different countries, indicates a general
prevalence of the ideas which such expressions are
fitted to suggest. The prevailing opinion in modern
times has referred all the nations of the earth to a

common parentage; and this it has done chiefly, as it would appear, on the authority of our Sacred History, the testimony of which seems hardly to be reconciled with a different hypothesis. Of late, however, many learned men, chiefly on the continent, have been strongly inclined to adopt an opinion similar to that of the ancients; and this seems now to be gaining proselytes among the French naturalists and physiologists, and among writers on history and antiquities in Germany. Some of the former speak of the Adamic race as of one among many distinct tribes. Von Humboldt, who has collected so many evidences of intercourse between the inhabitants of the eastern and western continents, yet seems to have regarded the primitive population of America as a distinct and peculiar stock. The celebrated geographer Malte Brun has plainly taken it for granted that each part of the earth had indigenous inhabitants from the earliest times, into whose origin it is vain to make inquiries; and even the accomplished Niebuhr, who is not more distinguished by the great extent of his learning than by the novelty and ingenuity of his critical speculations, has adopted a similar opinion in connexion with his researches into the early history of Italy.[a]

It would be no difficult matter to cite names of equal celebrity on the other side of this question,[b]

[a] Römische Geschichte von B. G. Niebuhr : Vorrede, p. 38 (1 Ausgabe).
[b] Sir W. Jones.

but it is not by the authority of opinions that it can ever be decided. The most learned men, and those of the most profound research, are equally liable with ordinary individuals to adopt erroneous notions on subjects which lie beyond a particular sphere; they are perhaps even more disposed to prejudices of certain kinds. It is only by examining the evidence which may be drawn from a variety of different sources, that those persons who feel interested in this inquiry can hope to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

Perhaps those arguments which bear with the greatest weight upon this question, and on which the ultimate opinion of philosophers respecting it is to be determined, are considerations resulting from a survey of the natural history of the globe, and facts connected with physical geography, and with the multiplication and dispersion of species both of animals and plants. On the evidence which is to be deduced from these sources, I shall say nothing at present. I have endeavoured to take a comprehensive view of the whole of this subject in my Researches into the Physical History of Mankind.

Among the investigations which belong exclusively to the history of our own species, an analysis of languages, affording the means of comparing their component materials and ascertaining their affinities and diversities, is one of the most important.

It must be a matter of regret to those who are aware of the real value of this resource, that it has

been applied with so little judgment, and that many
writers who have devoted themselves to the study
of what is termed *philology* have mixed up so much
that is extravagant and chimerical with the results
of their researches, as not only to throw a shade of
doubt and uncertainty over them, but even to bring
ridicule and contempt upon the pursuits in which
they have been engaged. A fondness for wild con-
jecture and for building up systems upon the most
inadequate and precarious foundations has been sup-
posed to belong to the whole class of writers on the
history and affinities of languages, and it has cer-
tainly prevailed in no ordinary degree among them.
Even some of the latest works on these subjects,
though abounding with curious and valuable infor-
mation, are in a particular manner liable to this
censure. The treatise of Professor Murray on the
European languages, though it displays extensive
knowledge and diligent research, is scarcely men-
tioned without ridicule; and in the Asia Polyglotta
of M. Julius Klaproth, which has added very con-
siderably to our acquaintance with the dialects and
genealogy of the Asiatic races, we find the results of
accurate investigation mixed up and blended with
too much that is uncertain and hypothetical. It
must, however, be allowed, that there are not a few
writers, in both earlier and later times, who are
scarcely, if in any degree, chargeable with the same
faults, and whose acuteness and soundness of dis-
cernment are equal to their extensive and profound

erudition. This may be truly said of Vossius and Edward Lhuyd among the philologists of former ages, and in more recent times of Professor Vater, the Schlegels, Bopp, and Professor Jacob Grimm.

The comparison of languages is perhaps incapable of affording all the results which some persons have anticipated from it. It would be too much to expect from this quarter to demonstrate the unity of race, or an original sameness of idiom in the whole human species. But this resource, if properly applied, will furnish great and indispensable assistance in many particular inquiries relating to the history and affinity of nations.

It would be easy to point out instances in which the examination of languages has rendered substantial and undoubted services to the historian. The history of the Goths, who conquered the Roman empire, will furnish an example. The real origin of this people could not have been known with certainty, if we had not come into possession of an ample specimen of their language in the version of Ulphilas. By this we learn that they were not Getæ or Thracians, as most of the writers who lived near to the era of the Gothic invasion supposed them to be, and as some modern historians have maintained; but, in conformity with their own traditions, nearly allied in kindred to the northern tribes of the German family.[1]

The origin of the Polynesian races has been illustrated by an investigation in one respect similar.

Some of these tribes are found in islands so distant from all other inhabited regions, as to furnish an argument in favour of the opinion, that they had the beginning of their existence in their present abodes. But a comparison of their languages has furnished proof that all the most remote insular nations of the Great Ocean derived their origin from the same quarter, and are nearly related to some tribes of people inhabiting a part of the Indian continent and the isles of the Indian archipelago.[2]

Even the history of the African[3] and American[4] tribes has been in many particulars elucidated by an inquiry into the relations of their languages, though the results which have been obtained have not proved to be precisely those which were hypothetically anticipated, and with hope of arriving at which these researches were in part undertaken.

Philologists have sought in vain in the old continent for a nation, from whose speech the diversified idioms of America may with any degree of probability be derived ; but an examination of the American languages themselves has led to some interesting results. The native races of North America are referred by a classification of their dialects to a few great divisions, several of which extend as radii issuing from a common centre in the north-western part of the continent, where it is divided from Asia by Behring's Strait. The traditions prevalent among the ancient Mexicans seem to have derived credit from the discovery of a chain

of nations extending almost from New Mexico to
Mount St. Elias, in the neighbourhood of the
Esquimaux Tschugazzi ; their languages, particu-
larly those of the Ugalyachmutzi and Koluschians,
bearing a curious analogy to that of the Aztecs and
Tlaxcallans. Another series of nations, the Karalit,
or Esquimaux, connected by affinities of dialect, has
been traced from the settlements of the Tschuktschi
in Asia, along the polar zone to Acadia and Green-
land. Light has also been thrown in a similar
manner on the history of the Lenni Lenape, and
the great kindred family of Algonquin nations, on
that of the Iroquois, and likewise of the Floridian
and other races of North America, by a comparison
of their national traditions with the indications dis-
covered in their dialects. One circumstance, which
is perhaps of more importance than all the preced-
ing, is the singular congruity in structure between
all the American languages, from the northern to
the southern extremity of the continent. To this
I only allude at present, having already in another
place surveyed the facts on which the observation is
founded, as they have been developed by the re-
searches of Barton, Hervas, Von Humboldt, Hecke-
welder, and Duponceau. In Africa a remarkable
and interesting fact was the discovery of a nation
occupying nearly the whole northern region of that
continent, to which the Kabyles of Mauritania and
the Tuarik of the Great Desert belong, and whose
branches extend from the Oasis of Siwah on the

eastern, to the mountains of Atlas, and even to the Canary islands, on the western side; the Guanches, the old inhabitants of those islands, whose remains are said to lie embalmed in the mummy caves of Teneriffe, spoke, as it appears, a dialect of the same language as the Kabyles and Berbers. The Felatahs, who have spread themselves over the interior countries of Nigritia, have been traced by a similar investigation to the mountainous districts above the Senegal, where the Foulahs, who speak the same language, have been long known to Europeans as a people in many respects distinguishable from the Negroes. To the southward of the equator a connexion still more extended has been discovered among the native tribes across the whole of the same continent from Caffraria and the Mosambique coast, on the Indian ocean, to the countries which border on the Atlantic, and form a part of the region termed the empire of Congo.

I have thus pointed out some of the most striking instances, well known to those who have made philological subjects their pursuit, in which researches of this kind have thrown some light on the origin and affinities of nations, when all other historical resources have failed. I shall presently consider the application of this inquiry to the European nations, as this is my principal object in the present work. It is requisite, however, before I proceed so far, to make some general remarks on the evidence

which languages appear to furnish in proof of the affinity of nations.

The use of languages really cognate must be allowed to furnish a proof, or at least a strong presumption, of kindred race. Exceptions may indeed, under very peculiar circumstances, occur to the inference founded on this ground. For example, the French language is likely to be the permanent idiom of the negro people of St. Domingo, though the latter are principally of African descent. Slaves imported from various districts in Africa, having no common idiom, have adopted that of their masters. But conquest, or even captivity, under different circumstances, has scarcely ever exterminated the native idiom of any people, unless after many ages of subjection, and even then vestiges have perhaps always remained of its existence. In Britain the native idiom was nowhere superseded by the Roman, though the island was held in subjection upwards of three centuries. In Spain and in Gaul several centuries of Latin domination, and fifteen under German and other modern dynasties, have proved insufficient entirely to obliterate the ancient dialects, which were spoken by the native people before the Roman conquest.[c] Even the Gypsies, who have wandered in small companies over Europe for some ages, still preserve their original language in a form that can be everywhere recognised.

[c] Without adverting to the Bas Bréton, the Basque in Aquitaine and the Biscayan in Spain afford proofs of the fact above asserted.

But the question is here naturally suggested, what degrees and species of resemblance must be considered as indicating any given languages to be cognate, or as constituting their affinity? In adverting to this inquiry I shall be allowed to repeat some remarks which I have made on a former occasion.

A comparison of various languages displays four different relations between them.

1. In comparing some languages we discover little or no analogy in their grammatical structure, but we trace, nevertheless, a resemblance more or less extensive in their vocabularies, or in the terms for particular objects, actions, and relations. If this correspondence is the result of commercial intercourse, or conquest, or the introduction of a new system of religion, literature, and manners, it will extend only to such words as belong to the new stock of ideas thus introduced, and will leave unaffected the great proportion of terms which are expressive of more simple ideas and universal objects. Of the description now alluded to is the influence which the Arabic has exerted upon the idioms of the Persians and the Turks, and the Latin upon some of the dialects of Europe. But if the correspondence traced in the vocabularies of any two languages is so extensive as to involve words of the most simple and apparently primitive class, it obviously indicates a much more ancient and intimate connexion. There may be instances in which

this sort of affinity is so near as to render it pro-
bable, that the dialects thus connected had a com-
mon origin, and owe the diversities of their gram-
matical forms to subsequent changes and difference
of culture.

2. There are certain languages which have very
few words in common, and which yet display, when
carefully examined, a remarkable analogy in their
laws of grammatical construction.

The most striking instances of this relation are
the *polysynthetic* idioms, as they are denominated
by M. Duponceau, of the American tribes, and the
monosyllabic languages of the Chinese and Indo-
Chinese nations.

3. A third relation is discovered between lan-
guages which are shewn to be connected by both of
the circumstances already pointed out. These are
the languages which I venture to term *cognate*.
The epithet is applied to all those dialects which
are connected by analogy in grammatical forms, and
by a considerable number of primitive words or
roots common to all, or in all resembling, and
manifestly of the same origin.

4. A fourth relation exists between languages in
which neither of the connecting characters above
described can be discerned : when there is neither
analogy of grammatical structure, nor any corre-
spondence in words sufficient to indicate a particular
affinity. Such languages are not of the same family,
and they generally belong to nations remote from

each other in descent, and often in physical cha-
racters.[5]   But even among languages thus dis-
covered, a few common or resembling words may
often be found.   These resemblances are sometimes
casual, or the result of mere accident : in other
instances they are perhaps too striking and too
numerous to be ascribed to chance or coincidence.
Such are the phenomena of connexion which M.
Klaproth hypothetically terms *antediluvian*, and
those which Mr. Sharon Turner has lately pointed
out between the idioms of nations very remote
from each other.   More strongly marked are the
traces of approximation observed by Professors
Barton and Vater between the vocabularies of tribes
in North and even in South America, and the
dialects of the Samoiedes, Yukagers, and other
races in North-eastern Asia.   Such facts are some-
times difficult of explanation ; in other instances
they may lead to interesting results.   Whatever
may be thought of them, the variety of languages,
nearly or wholly unconnected, is on a general
survey so great, that it seems difficult to avoid
being led to one of two conclusions : either that
there existed from the beginning divers idioms,
or that the languages of mankind were rendered
various by a miraculous change, according to the
most obvious import of a well known passage in
the book of Genesis.   It would be foreign to my
present design to consider these opinions more
fully, and I shall pass them by with a single

remark on each. The former, besides other objec-
tions, involves one which has scarcely been ad-
verted to. It implies that the world contained
from the beginning, not three or four, as some
writers are willing to believe, but some hundreds
and perhaps thousands of different human races.[d]
With respect to the latter, it seems incumbent
on those who reject this passage of Sacred History
on the ground of its making a reference to a super-
natural, and, as it may be termed, an unknown
agency, to furnish us with some account of the
first existence of our species which does not imply
events, at least equally miraculous. Unless the
events which certainly took place can be under-
stood in a different way from that in which the
Sacred Scriptures represent them, we may ration-
ally adhere to the whole of the same testimony, as
involving the operation of no other causes, than
such as are both proved and are sufficient to account
for the phenomena.

In the inquiry on which I have now to enter, I
must confine my view within a narrower sphere,
and advert to the relations of languages which,
though displaying great variety in their vocabulary,

[d] The languages of the African nations, according to Seetzen, who has
made the most extensive and original researches into this subject, amount to
one hundred or one hundred and fifty. In America, there are said to be
fifteen hundred idioms "notabilmente diversi." Such was the opinion of
Lopez, a missionary of great knowledge in the languages both of South
and North America. (See Seetzen's letters in Von Zach's Monathliche
Correspondenz. 1810, p. 328, and Hervas's 'Catalogo delle Lingue,'
p. 11).

yet approximate in their most essential constituents and are nearly connected in their grammatical formation. Such phenomena can only be explained on the supposition that a different superstructure has been raised by different nations on a basis originally common. Tribes having a common idiom scanty in its stock of words, appear separately to have added to their speech, partly by new invention, and partly by borrowing from their neighbours, such terms as the progress of knowledge among them required. The accessory parts of languages may have come at length to bear a considerable proportion to the primitive one, or even to exceed it, and the grammatical structure may have been diversified under different modes of cultivation. Hence arise in the first place varieties of dialect; but when the deviation is greater in degree, it constitutes diversity of language. The German and French are never termed dialects of one speech; and yet all who compare their respective sources, the old Teutonic and the Latin languages, are aware that between these, a near and deeply rooted affinity subsists.

Those who will duly weigh the facts which associate themselves with this last consideration, will, I believe, experience no difficulty in admitting all such languages to be cognate, which have in common, together with analogy in grammatical forms, a large number of undoubtedly original and primitive words. Such words are simple vocables,

expressive of the most natural and universal objects and ideas, terms for family relations and for the most striking objects of visible nature, as likewise verbal roots of the most frequent and general occurrence. These are elements of language which must have belonged to every tribe of men in their original dispersion over the world, and which must have been the most tenaciously retained, and scarcely interchanged between different nations. When such elementary parts of speech are common to several languages, and when their grammatical structure displays likewise undoubted marks of a real and fundamental affinity, we may be allowed to regard these languages as cognate, though the number of words peculiar to each may be very considerable.

I have dwelt the more fully on this last consideration, because on it will depend the validity of the conclusions which I shall endeavour to draw in the course of the following treatise. I shall now advert particularly to the population of Europe and the history of the races of which it consists.

NOTES TO SECTION I.

(1). *The Goths not Thracians nor Getæ.*—Nothing is more certain than that the language of the Ulphiline translations is German. It is almost as certain that it was the language of the Goths. It is less certain that it was the language of their associates—the Vandals.

The inference of the text is unexceptionable—viz., that the Goths who conquered the Roman Empire, were Germans. It does not, however, follow that *all* Goths were in this category. There may have been others, who, taking no part in the subversion of Rome, spoke no German. Again, it by no means follows that the Germans who conquered the Roman Empire were Goths in the strict sense of the term. They may have been Goths only as the English are Britons, *i.e.* they may never have been called Goths at all, until they settled in the country of the Getæ, and then they may never have called *themselves* so. *Goth*, in short, may have been the name by which they were known to their neighbours; just as *Saxon* is the name by which an Englishman is known to the Welsh.

That both these views are real rather than hypothetical—that no German population ever called itself Gothic, except in the way that we of England call ourselves Britons, and that the true Goths belonged to another family—has been maintained by the present editor elsewhere.

The statement that the tribes who spoke the language of the Ulphiline translations were neither Getæ nor Thracians is accurate. Had its author, however, lived to see the publication of the Deutsche Sprache of Grimm, he would have seen it reversed. The doctrine of Grimm is that the Getæ and Thracians were Germans—Germans whose language was that of Ulphilas. Whether he has made out his case is another matter.

(2). *The Origin of the Polynesian Races.*—Polynesian means an Inhabitant of the South Sea Islands,—the islands to the south

of New Guinea, New Guinea itself, Australia, and Van Diemen's Land, or Tasmania, being excepted. These belong to a different stock. In the Fiji Islands it is believed that there is an inter-mixture. The remaining forms of speech fall under two divisions, the Micronesian and the Polynesian Proper. Micro-nesia includes the Carolines and Marianne Isles, along with Sonsoral, Lord North's Island, and the Pellew group to the east of the Philippines. The Radack and Ralik Archipelagos lead to the Navigation Isles, with which Polynesia Proper begins. This contains the Friendly and Society Isles, the islands of Dangerous Archipelago, the distant Easter Island, the Sandwich Islands, far as they lie northwards, and New Zealand, far as it lies to the south.

Nor is this all. The Micronesian group connects itself with the Philippines, the Philippines with the Moluccas, the Moluccas with Celebes, Java, etc., and these with the Malay of Sumatra and the Malayan Peninsula. Hence, in a very wide sense of the term, the whole great class has been denominated Malay.

Again, distant as is the Island of Madagascar, and different as it is in its direction, its language is, in many points, Malay—a fact known to Reland and other early investigators.

Lastly, it may be remarked that the lines by which the monosyllabic languages on one side, and the Papuan, Australian, and Tasmanian, on the other, are separated, are by no means of that broad and definite character once supposed.

(3). *African Languages.*—The evidence that all the tongues of Africa are mutually related, is now conclusive. This is because, in many cases, fresh *data* have been accumulated; as is most especially the case with the Negro languages. In others, however, the process has been somewhat different. Dis-tinctions which were originally held to be broad and definite, have been broken down. This has taken place most especially with the tongues of the extreme north and the extreme south.

To begin with the former. The languages akin to the Hebrew and Arabic—Semitic as they are called—were long either isolated, or, if connected with those of any other class, connected with the so-called Indo-European forms of speech. This was on the strength of the higher civilization, greater his-torical importance, and superior physical organization of the nations which spoke them. Writers, however, were not slow to

observe that the populations of northern Africa in generaltwere, to a great extent, possessed of the same characteristics. Such were the Ægyptians, whose language was the Coptic, a language which was one of the first to be recognised as one exhibiting Semitic characteristics. This was not doubted. It was only doubted whether the Coptic was, in the ordinary sense of the word, African.

Then came a language to which the French conquest of Algeria gave prominence, whilst it also made it accessible ; the language of the Kabyles, Tuaricks, Siwans, and Canary Islanders, etc. This was recognised, if not as actually Semitic, as what was designated by the new term, *sub*-Semitic.

That other tongues, especially those in geographical contact with the Kabyle (Berber or Amazirgh), were, more or less, what the Berber was, was shown by even the Berber scholars, the foremost of whom recognised, in the Haussa of Sudania, Berber elements (*See* a paper by Francis Newman in the Appendix to Prichard's *Physical History of Man,—Africa*).

Then came the turn for the tongues to the south of the Coptic area to be considered as, more or less, Coptic ; *e.g.* the Bisharye, the Nubian, and the Galla ; and, finally, that for the languages of Abyssinia in contact with the recognised Semitic tongues (such as the Tigre, Amharic, etc.), but not themselves Semitic. Of these the Agow and Falasha forms of speech are the chief.

With this relation between the Semitic and sub-Semitic classes, — a relation made patent by the name itself, — the question as to the relations of the African languages at large, must either remain stationary, or one of two alternatives be resorted to.

Either languages like the Haussa, Nubian, Agow, etc., must lead to the true negro tongues, or they must be wholly separated from them. It is not too much to say that, on the part of the proper Semitic philologues, the tendency was towards separation. This, however, was impossible. Whoever knew anything of the other African languages, knew that for every step from such languages as the Coptic and Berber, towards the Hebrew and Arabic, a similar advance could be made in the opposite direction, *i.e.* towards the Fellatah, Mandingo, and Woloff, and hrough these to the most Negro languages of the whole continent.

This is the way in which one of the old lines of demar-
cation is broken down.

The breaking down of another of them is as follows. The
languages of the great Kaffre family, which, to the English-
man of the Cape, have the same importance as the Berber of
Algeria to the Frenchman, struck their first cultivators with two
points of grammar, known under the names of the Euphonic
Alliteration and the System of Prefixes.

According to the former, when two words stand in certain
grammatical relations to one another, the initial letter of the
subordinate is changed to that of the governing, term, just as if
we said, in English, *bun beam* instead of *sun-beam*.

According to the latter, every noun has, as its concomitant,
some non-radical prefix, so necessary, that when the missionaries
would introduce such English words as *priest* or *pharisee*, the
form they took in Kaffre was *um-priest, um-pharisee*. The details
of these two remarkable characters need not be given. They
are only noticed for the sake of suggesting the extent to which
they would give the languages wherein they occurred a peculiar
physiognomy. Doing this, they had a tendency to create broad
and definite lines of demarcation. Hence the separation between
the Semitic tongues on the north, and the inland and western
dialects, was repeated, in the south, between the Kaffre and the
non-Kaffre languages.

So is its abrogation. The ethnological import of the two
characteristics in question has never been very closely con-
sidered. They may mean much; they may mean little. They
are assumed, at once, to mean the former. Meanwhile, traces
of both the prefixes and the alliteration are discovered elsewhere,
sometimes in languages easily connected with the proper Kaffre,
but sometimes in languages far distant. To such an extent has
this been the case, that, in Koelle's Polyglotta Africana, a
whole groupe of languages spoken on the drainages of the Gambia
and Senegal are, without being called Kaffre, described as
" distinguishing themselves like those of South Africa, by
prefixal changes, or an initial inflection."

The exact interpretation of the vast and complicated series of
phenomena of this kind belongs to special African philology;
the present remarks being to the effect that the African lan-
guages, instead of presenting a mass of unconnected forms of
speech, may now be considered as members of one group—a

group, of course, of high classificational value, but still a group—indicating a fundamental unity in the way of language.

(4). *American Languages.*—*Mutatis mutandis,* what applies to the languages of Africa applies to those of America also. The more we make researches into their details, the more we find likeness—likeness which breaks down lines of demarcation previously recognised.

The chief problems concerning the forms of speech of the Western hemisphere are :—

1. Their relations to each other.

2. Their relations to those of the Old World.

1. In respect to the first, they have been considered from the two points of view noticed in the forthcoming pages; viz., in respect to their grammatical structure, and in respect to their lexicography.

a. In respect to the former, it has been admitted, since the time of Duponceau, at least, that they all bear a common character, a character denominated *polysynthetic.* I do not inquire how far this is an accurate term or the contrary. It is enough to know that all the later investigators have attributed to all the languages of America a general resemblance in respect to their grammatical structure.

b. In respect to their words, the view has been different. The extent to which several languages, like each other in their grammatical principles, differed in their vocabularies, has long been enlarged upon. Hence arose the apparent paradox of some scores, or even hundreds, of languages resembling one another in their general physiognomy, yet unlike in their constituent elements.

That the paradox is apparent rather than real, has been for some years the expressed opinion (supported by numerous tables of comparison) of the present writer. In other words, he has connected the American languages with each other, glossarially as well as grammatically. At the same time, the likeness by no means lies on the surface.

2. The second question has also been illustrated by recent researches; the effect of which has been to diminish the gulph which separates the tongues of the New World from the Old. In the first place, and, as a preliminary to any further investigation, we must remember that the one language common to the

two hemispheres—the Eskimo—has always been admitted to be American in grammar.

It may be added that this complicated the question, inasmuch as it tended to separate it from the Asiatic, without connecting it with the American, tongues; for the contrast between the Eskimo vocabularies and the languages in its immediate neighbourhood, was as decided as that between any two languages of America—that is, according to the current doctrine.

This contrast, however, was in the same category with the former one—apparent rather than real. As the Eskimo area is approached from the east, through the Samoyed, Yeniseian, Yukahiri, Kamskadale, and Koriak tongues of Asia, the American character in the way of grammar appears in Asia; and, *vice versâ*, as the same area is approached through the languages of North Oregon, the Hudson's Bay country, and Russian America, Eskimo words appear in the western hemisphere.

One of the languages of the present text, the Ugalents, or Ugalyachmutsi of the parts about Mount St. Elias has, by more than one philologue, been considered Eskimo. This (in the stricter sense of the term) it is not. Neither is it, as has also been held, Kolosh, *i.e.* a member of a class intermediate to the Eskimo and certain other tongues. On the contrary, it belongs to the group which contains the Chepewyan, Beaver, Indian, Taculli, and other northern forms of speech—separated from the Eskimo as genera of the same order, but certainly orders of the same class.

The Tshugatsi are actual Eskimo.

The Kolosh (Koluschian) is the language of the parts about Sitka or New Archangel.

The Astek or Mexican words found in these languages, were indicated in the Mithridates. Since the publication, however, of that work, they have been shown to exist in other American languages—some inland, some southern, some interjacent to the Kolosh and Mexican areas, *e.g.* in California and elsewhere. The inference from this fact, *taken by itself*, is that the Mexican and Eskimo words are portions of a common stock, rather than elements peculiar to the two languages in question.

I use the words " *taken by itself*" for the sake of making a reservation. The question whether the languages of the extreme north-west of America have special, or only general, affinities with the Mexican, is not decided by a mere comparison of words.

There is in the Mexican a remarkable phonesis, as is suggested by the number of words ending in *tl*—*axolotl*, etc.—a harsh combination. Now this phonesis appears in the Eskimo, takes a great development in the Kolosh and other northern tongues, extends as far as Oregon, diminishes in California, nearly disappears as we go south, but reappears in Mexico. Is this sufficient to establish a special relationship? The answer to the question has yet to be given. It is a point, however, with which the present work has little or nothing to do.

When speculation first began, the Eskimo of Greenland and Labrador was compared with the Indian of Canada and New England. Now both these were extreme forms of their respective classes. The Eskimo of Greenland and Labrador was the most eastern of his congeners; the Indian of the Eskimo frontier the most American of his. They were each, by the whole breadth of the American continent, separated from Asia. Yet they were the only two that could be compared. Russian America and North Oregon were *terræ incognitæ*. Yet they were just the points where the phenomenon of one division graduating into another were best studied.

But they were unknown. Hence the nearest comparison was between the representatives of a maximum difference. In time, however, the real areas got studied. In the first place, the Chepewyan tongues were studied in their more western dialects. Then came the researches of the admirable philologue to the United States' Exploring Expedition—Mr. Hale. These shed a flood of light over the previously obscure interspace. The truth had been dimly surmised before. His *data*, however, put it beyond doubt. On the coast of the Pacific it was difficult to say where the Eskimo ended and where the Indian tongues began, a fact which made the hitherto obscure origin of the American clear. It is now easier to connect them with Asia, than it is to connect Europe, Africa, New Guinea, Australia, or Tasmania. A difficult problem has become a simple straightforward matter-of-fact phenomenon.

It would not have been impossible for this to have been the case earlier. At any rate, when two languages as far removed from each other in the matter of geographical position as the Samoyed of Siberia, and the Sioux tongues of the Missouri prairies, came to possess good representatives in the shape of

Castren's Grammar and Lexicon of the first, and Riggs' Grammar of the second, it only wanted a skilful and painstaking investigator to show that, even with the interval between the points of comparison, likeness could be detected. The researches of Mr. Daae of Christiania have shown this.

The Lenni Lenape.—The Indians of Delaware called themselves thus—*lenni = man.* It is a term of great extent and importance. Change the *l* into *t*, and *lenni* becomes *tinne*, a word meaning *man* in all the Athabaskan tongues; so much so, that Sir John Richardson proposed calling them the *Tinne* class of languages, so thoroughly does the name appear in them all. In the form *tenghie, tungaas*, it appears in other languages, chiefly in Russian America and Oregon. Yet it does not stop here. It is found promiscuously in numerous tongues, southwards and inland.

Again, Dr. Prichard (no careless adopter of proper names) held that it was the Eskimo *inn-*, in *innu-it = men.* It may be added that it is, word for word, the *aino* of the Kurilian Islands. It is also the *denka, tonghus*, etc., of more than one Siberian tongue, and—as Sir John Richardson had, with proper diffidence (not noticing the intermediate forms), suggested—the *duinhe* of the Scotch Gaels.

This, however, is episodic and extraneous to the main question, which is concerning the Lenni Lenape. They were not only a single section of a very vast family, but they were early known to be so. Their congeners were spread over the greater part of the New England States, part of Canada, part of Labrador, the interior of America as far as the Rocky Mountains (the Black-foot Indians belonging to the class), Virginia, and even parts of the Carolinas: so vast was the Lenne Lenape area. Some call it Lenapean, some Algonkin, some Algik—a barbarous abbreviation of the preceding denomination.

Be this, however, as it may, the class itself was one of great magnitude.

The same applies to—

The Iroquois.—Members of this class occupied New York, the shores of Lake Huron, and parts of the Carolinas, separated from each other by branches of the Algonkins, but still forming a large class.

The Florida Indians, in like manner, belong to a group (the Creek, Muskoghe, or Muscogulghe) which is itself a branch of a

larger stock, containing the Cherokees, and probably the Caddos, Woccons, Catawbas, and other less important tribes. Add to this, that (without inordinately raising its value) we may comprise within it the Iroquois (just mentioned) and the great Sioux class.

Such, at least, is the result to which recent researches point.

All this, then, is so much in favour of a certain amount of uniformity of language over large geographical areas.

A population mentioned in the text, may here be noticed :—

The Yukagers. — The Yukagers, Yugaghiri, Yukajiri, or Yukahiri, are one of the most northern populations of Asia, their occupancy being the shore of the Arctic Sea. With the exception of the Tshuktshi and Asiatic Eskimo, they are also the most eastern. They are also one of those least known, a single sample of their language being all that we possess.

Their country, the drainage of the Kolyma, Jana, and Indijerka rivers, is bounded on the west by the territory of the Jakuts, and on the east by that of the Sedentary Tshuktshi. On both sides it has been encroached on; the area of the Yukahiri having at one time been much larger than it is now. Hence their language, from the obliteration of the dialects spoken on the circumference of its area, is comparatively isolated.

This appearance of isolation is increased by the scantiness of its vocabulary. Hence, in the Asia Polyglotta, the Yukahiri tongue is placed by itself. And this isolation has been admitted by Prichard and most other writers.

The present writer, objecting to this view, has shown that it has much in common with the Yeniscian and Samoyed. Hence, when the Samoyed came to be considered as a member of the great Finn, or Ugrian, class, the Yukahiri was placed in it also.

Yet the Yukahiri has (there or thereabouts) equal affinities with the Koriak, Kamskadale, and Eskimo, as it has with the languages of north-western America.

The following sample is instructive :

If we compare the numerals *one, two, three, four, five*, of the Yukahiri with the languages of its neighbourhood, we find no resemblance. If, however, we go beyond *five*, and ask the names for *seven* and *eight*, we find that they are compounds, and compounds of an interesting character.

To illustrate this, let us imagine the English numerals to run thus—*one, pair, leash, four, five, six, five-and-two, five-and-three,*

nine, ten. In this list the words for *two* and *three* are wanting in their proper places, being replaced by *pair* and *leash;* meanwhile they appear in the names for *seven* and *eight.* In short, they are true portions of the language, though not seen to be so at first.

Indeed, in a comparison of the English with the German numerals, which run *ein, zwei, drei,* etc., they might be overlooked altogether, and, on the strength of their having so been overlooked, the statement might be made that the numerals for *two* and *three* were different in the two languages. Yet such would not be the case; when we got as far as *seven* and *eight,* they would show themselves.

Mutatis mutandis, this applies to the Yukahiri numerals as compared with those of certain *American* languages.

A full explanation of all the phenomena connected with the languages of America, especially the great extent to which they differ from each other, has yet to be given. An important contribution to it, however, has been made by Mr. Daae of Christiania, in one paper published in the Edinburgh Philosophical Transactions, and in another in the Transactions of the Philological Society. They belong to what may be called philological dynamics, *i.e.* the investigation of the forces that effect changes in language.

In the first of his papers, Mr. Daae gives great prominence to the habit attributed to several rude tribes (one which he shows to be commoner than is generally imagined), of always choosing wives from a different tribe from their own, or (at any rate) from some different section of the community.

In the second, he gives a special monograph on the American languages, paying particular attention to the smallness of the American communities. " When language is confined to the daily use of a family or a small knot of acquaintance, it stands in a quite contrary relation to the use of men, to what it does when it is the common medium that combines millions of human beings. In the last case, the individual license in changing the adopted sounds and significations of words, whereby are introduced novelties of speech, is continually checked by the impossibility of making all such unnecessary changes comprehensible to the mass of those who speak: Thus we see that in the present English and French languages, this license of adding to what is the common property of millions in both hemispheres, is a privilege for only a few distinguished inventors of new things, or authors of

widely-read books. The power of changing language is so much repressed that it can only be observed by comparing two remote periods of the history of language, as you observe the geological changes by considering generations as merely a single day. The habit of speaking distinctly is then kept up and cultivated as a necessary means to be comprehended by the many unknown persons you continually meet with.

"In a small island in the South Sea, or an insignificant tribe in the wildnesses of America or Siberia, the facility of changing language may easily be conceived to be next to unbounded. Everybody who speaks must become understood, because his hearers almost know beforehand what he is to say. The most arbitrary changes of language are thus introduced continually, as may be proved historically.

"Almost all those languages that are spoken by nations living either in a natural (geographical) isolation, or in an arbitrary and artificial one, want a good number of letters. For one letter in one dialect, is substituted another letter in the next tribe; because every word is as well understood whether you pronounce it with the letter _r_, or _l_, or _v_. Accidental and individual defects of uttering are thus changed into national peculiarities, and a general indistinctness of pronunciation is introduced. The sounds that are hardly perceptible to a stranger will, among close relatives, appear sufficiently intelligible."

"The strange practices of mutilating the nose and the lips must have contributed a great deal to disfigure the enunciation of language itself. The insertion of one or more large pieces of wood into incisions in the lips or the nose, still practised on the Pacific coast (Tr. Geogr. Soc. vol. ii. p. 218), and from which custom a tribe is called _Nez Percé_, has no doubt been more frequent formerly, as we see that all such cruel absurdities as tattooing, flattening the heads of children, etc., are the first prejudices a savage abandons when he comes in contact with the Whites (Hooper, Tents of the Tuski, p. 270). These mutilations would evidently make it next to impossible to pronounce any labial consonant, and they would in return introduce a nasal articulation. Now a paucity of labial, and a superfluity of nasal, sounds is just what we observe in many American languages.

"Similar permutations of letters of course happen among all languages of the world, and in fact form the basis and the principal means by which the differences in language are introduced

and produced. Only among those nations who lead an isolated life are these changes more violent, and appear to separate tribes that evidently, from their general habits and manners, must be very closely related. Thus the Dakotas, forming only a nation of 25,000 individuals, are split into tribes divided by such considerable differences of dialect as these :—one tribe changes *d* into *t*, and *h* into *r* ; another changes *h* into *k* ; a third changes *h* into *g* ; *d* is altogether rejected, and *l* substituted in its place ; another band only uses *g* at the end of syllables, and *l* does not occur ; thus the word *hda*, ' to go home,' becomes *kda* and *gla* in different dialects. This same tendency will of course introduce as violent euphonic changes within the same language or dialect in the way of declension, conjugation, and the formation or composition of words."

" In the syllabic alphabet invented for the Cherokee tongue by a native, the whole number of possible syllables is merely seventy, besides the vowels (Trans. Amer. Ethn. Soc. v. ii. 119). In the excellent Dakota dictionary of Mr. Riggs, we see abundant proofs how a scarcity of radical words and simple ideas is made to expand into a language of endless compositions. But from the variety of objects to be expressed, these composed words in a great measure must contain the most arbitrary description of things : a continual make-shift of substitutes for the thing that is thus obscurely brought before the mind. For instance, the word *maza* means 'metal of any kind,' *gâdi*, 'merchandize' ; hence are derived, by addition of other substantives, or adjectives and particles, compositions expressing an *anchor, iron-pot, bracelet, bell, trap, chair, gun* and all its parts, *pistol, cannon, lock, ramrod,* etc., *nail, steelyard, blacksmith, spade, finger-ring, stove, skates, sword, iron, silver, money, dollar, shilling, banknote, medal, gold, lead, bullet, moulds, copper, pewter, button, spoon, pan, brass, file, hammer, pincers, tongs.* In like manner the syllable *ta* comprehends all ruminating animals and their parts.

" As another instance of arbitrary contrivances may be quoted the Dakota word *sungka*, that originally comprehended the ideas *dog, fox,* and *wolf.* But then the *dog*, being the animal first employed for carrying or drawing burdens, it was, after the settlement of the Europeans, also used of the horse when it came to be known to the Indians (*sungka-wakay = spirit dog, sacred dog = horse*). Thus it became the only radical word fit for

forming the further compounds denoting *horse, mare, colt, ass, saddle, whip, lasso, bridle,* etc."

"The state of small isolated tribes or clans in which the half-savage nations live, will as easily introduce an endless change of significations. In a family, or amongst the inmates of the same house, it is quite as easy to make arbitrary expressions or slang words understood and ultimately accepted as an indistinct utterance of the common words. Instead of *father*, you may say *master, governor, husband, the old one*, and the original word *father* you may restrict to *God* only; instead of *child* you may use any word signifying *little* or *dear*, etc. We have special accounts of two remarkable instances of the action of this principle among the rude tribes. One is the superstitious custom of the South Sea Islanders, on the death of a king whose name is composed of a couple of common words, to abstain altogether from the use of those words that form his name, and to substitute others. The practice is either ascribed to a reverence for him, or to some religious sentiment connected with omens. Such a custom will, of course, in many instances, lead to a permanent instead of a temporary change of language. The other fact upon this head is the sacred language employed by the conjurors or priests. As far as this has been accurately found out, for instance, in the Greenlandic, it seems to be chiefly an arbitrary perversion of the significations of old and known words. It is, then, the same principle as in Europe has formed any slang, for instance, among vagrants and thieves. Yet these words of the conjurors have been so far altered that any double meaning is sufficiently avoided.

"From the effect of these causes it appears probable that as one savage tribe may, from trifling occasions, suddenly split into two, that separate widely from each other, thus also their language may, in a comparatively short time, deviate into two very different dialects. If there were means of investigating the state of a given language of savages in different periods, it would perhaps be demonstrable that its formation as a peculiar dialect, or a variety of speech, does not require those thousands of years, as one might suppose, who starts from the fact that a great many Greek and Hebrew words have been preserved uncorrupted for thousands of years, through the influence of literature and civilization."

(5). *a. Languages with few words in common, yet with an analogy in respect to their grammatical construction.*—These constitute the class to which, according to certain remarks lately made, the languages of America belonged. The fact, however, in this particular instance was demurred to.

The general rule, however, may be true. How far it is so, is a question of some complexity; at any rate, a question requiring some preliminary considerations.

The further our researches carry us into the phenomena of speech the more they lead to the conclusion that the laws of language are the laws of growth and development. It seems, for instance, that a period wherein no inflexions are evolved precedes the period of inflections. In such a case, there is no declension, no conjugation, no case, no tense, no mood; no grammar in short, but only so many separate uninflected words, related to each other by certain details in respect to their position, and with few or no modifications of their forms. Utter such a sentence as *sun shine way air*, and you have an imperfect instance of this condition of language; the words mean, *(the) sun shine(s) through (the) air.*

In the next stage, it is maintained that certain of the words which, like *way (viá)* in the example just given, indicate the relation which the other words bear to each other, coalesce with the leading and more essential parts of the sentence, and so undergo a change of form. This is the case with the *nt* in *can't* as opposed to *can not*; *not* being capable of reduction to *ne whit (not-at-all).*

In this stage, the secondary words which coalesce with the main, do so in so imperfect a manner as to leave their originally separate existence visible. Languages in this state are called *agglutinate.* It is the state in which most of the languages of the world exist. The Mantshu and Mongol are the usual examples of this condition. Most other tongues, however, would serve as well.

The coalition of the subordinate with the main word having become so perfect as for the former to look like a part of the latter, rather than a word originally separate, the combination becomes *amalgamate* instead of *agglutinate*, and the language *inflectional.* The Greek and Latin are the types of this form.

Inflections fall off and get displaced by separate words, these words being of a peculiar kind—prepositions with substantives,

auxiliaries with verbs. The English is in this stage, and, doubt-
less, it is destined to further changes.

It is obvious that languages in the same stage will just be the
languages that present the "analogy" of the text.

It is also obvious that where they are separated from each
other by any great distance the vocabularies will be unlike.

Let the Hottentot and Fuegian be on the same stage of de-
velopment and there will be grammatical analogy but glossarial
difference.

Let the Italian and Latin be in different stages and there will
be glossarial likeness and grammatical difference.

*b. Languages where both the words and grammatical structure
differ*, will be languages both widely distant from each other and
in different stages, *e.g.* the Polynesian and the French.

More frequently, however—

a. It means languages, concerning which, a full and sufficient
comparison both of their words and inflections having been made,
a certain amount of difference may be predicated : or,

b. It may simply mean languages, the affinities of which have
not been recognized ; the doctrine being that *de non apparentibus
et non existentibus eadem habenda est ratio :* or,

c. It may mean languages between which a cursory inspec-
tion has failed to discover resemblances.

Of the former there are but few instances. In the mind of the
present writer there are none. The majority of the tongues that
stand alone, and without either particular or general affinities, only
do so because few investigators have studied them ; the neglect
having arisen sometimes from the insufficiency of materials, some-
times from the apparent unimportance of the language itself.
The more, however, they are looked to, the less is their
isolation.

Another class of languages is in a somewhat different pre-
dicament. These are, either geographically or in respect to their
cultivation, at vast distances from each other ; say at the two
extremes of the world of language. When these are compared,
how can we expect any notable amount of likeness—of likeness,
at least, that a cursory, or even a moderately close, inspection
can discover ? For this we must look to the interjacent
areas.

With this exception, it must be obvious that the present
writer holds that languages which differ in both words and gram-

matical structure, either do not do so entirely, or (if they do) constitute extreme forms.

Having thus considered the chief points of detail, upon which criticism was required, we may turn to the main question of the present section, viz., the value of the evidence of language as an instrument in ethnological inquiry.

A common language is *primâ facie* evidence in favour of a common lineage. But it is by no means conclusive. If naturalists and anatomists have laid undue stress upon differences in the way of physical conformation, and, so doing, have disparaged the phenomena of speech, philologues and scholars, ignorant of physiology, have too often overrated them.

The strongest instances of a mother-tongue being forgotten or un-learned, and a new language adopted in its stead, are to be found amongst the negroes of the New World. In St. Domingo, the Black languages are French and Spanish; in the United States, English; and in South America, Dutch, Spanish, and Portuguese. Here, however, the conditions were peculiar. The native language was no longer connected with the soil to which it was indigenous, but transplanted to a new area. Neither was it any single homogeneous form of speech that was obliterated, but, on the contrary, a multitude of mutually unintelligible tongues, which, under any circumstances, would have ended in the establishment of a Lingua Franca.

With the negro languages of the New World we have the *maximum* amount of change in speech with a *minimum* in the way of intermixture of blood. With the native American tribes, the phenomena of change are somewhat different. As a general rule, the number of individuals who speak one and the same language is remarkably small. Every now and then, however, in contact with these small patches of speech, is to be found some language spread over a considerable area, and spoken by several tribes. Some of these the missionaries have converted into Lingua Francas; it being a matter of observation that an American Indian learns an American language, no matter how unlike his own, easier than one from Europe. Many of the minor languages of the South American Republics and Brazil have been thus replaced by the Guarani.

In each of the previous cases, there is the actual replacement of one language by another. In the Lingua Franca of Europe this is not always the case. In the Levant, the Lingua Franca,

is spoken by numerous Arabs, Greeks, etc. The native Arabic, however, and the native Greek, co-exist by the side of it. There is no extinction as yet. Nevertheless, the tendencies towards it have set-in, inasmuch as where two languages have to be learned, the less useful is the weakest, and has a chance of going to the wall.

Sometimes, with two languages thus brought in contact with each other, we have the phenomenon of intermixture rather than obliteration—an intermediate tongue being formed out of the fusion of two. *A priori*, it seems likely that such should be the case *often*. In reality, however, the development of such a language as (say) C, out of languages A and B, is very rare indeed. The ordinary phenomenon is A with a certain amount of B, or B with a certain amount of A—the original character of the fundamental language being preserved. The English (for instance), for all its Latin elements, is German; the French, for all its German elements, Latin.

This suggests, that in language we have every degree of change, from simple intermixture to absolute obliteration and replacement. It also suggests that similarity of language is a matter of degree. There may be absolutely community of tongue, or there may be an admixture of say only *one per cent.* of foreign terms.

Language is one of those signs of community of origin which is slow to be abolished—slower than most others—slower, perhaps (on the whole), than any other; nevertheless, it is only a sign, and a sign capable of obliteration. Its relative permanence, when compared with other *criteria*, is a matter upon which there is a wide discrepancy of opinion; the facts upon which our hypotheses must rest being by no means easily ascertained. It is only certain that the questions involved in it are far too complicated to be disposed of by the application of any general rule. As new ideas are introduced, language changes. As new physical influences are brought into action, the anatomical conformation of the human body becomes modified. That these latter forces have *some* influence is universally admitted; though many competent authorities put a close limit on its extent. It is clear, however, that, within certain limits, both language and physical conformation may change.

They may change, too, at different rates—*i.e.*, in a given period (say ten generations) the speech may be considerably modified,

whilst the anatomy of the speakers remains the same. And, *vice versâ*, the physiognomies may alter, whilst language remains fixed. Every comparison of the difference of rate between such changes should be made on the merits of the particular question under notice, no general rule being sufficient.

Next comes the question of *limit*. Here we may safely say that the range of change in language is wider than that of which physical form is susceptible. It is, clearly, easier for a negro to be converted into a Frenchman in the matter of language, than in that of colour. Extreme forms of language may more easily be converted into each other than extreme forms of physical conformation; and this is all that can safely be said. It is by no means certain that a population of negroes, transplanted from a low alluvial swamp to an elevated mountain range, would not retain their language, without alteration, longer than they would their physical form—*within certain limits*.

The contact of two languages has a greater tendency to effect the obliteration of one of them than the development of a *tertium quid* out of their fusion.

The contact of different stocks in the way of physical union has a greater tendency to effect a *tertium quid* than the obliteration of one of the constituent elements.

From this it follows that languages are much more *either one thing or another* than stocks, races, or families. The language of Radnorshire and Cornwall is much more English (as opposed to Welsh) than the blood or pedigree of its speakers is English; indeed, as a general rule, the blood of a given population is more mixed than its language. This is because, whilst A and B, in the way of stock, blood, or pedigree, will give C (a true *tertium quid*, or a near approach to it), A and B, in the way of language, will only give themselves,—*i. e.* they will give no true *tertium quid*, nor any very close approach to it. These, however, are matters that belong to the question of Man in general rather than to Language. Language, (as an instrument of criticism in ethnology) is the most permanent of the *criteria* of human relationship derivable from our *moral* constitution, and, in some cases, equally permanent with physical form, though, in the case of extreme changes, less so.

It is not, however, to be supposed that these remarks exhaust the subject, and leave all objections answered. They only bring it to the point where it comes in contact with the ordinary and

current doctrines of the zoologist and physiologist ; these being
supposed to hold moderate, rather than extreme, views concerning
the immutability of specific characters, and also to acquiesce,
more or less, in the usual opinion concerning the sterility of
hybrids.   Where these views are ignored or objected to, a whole
vista of possible objections opens upon us.

For instance, the naturalist, who, admitting the fundamental
unity of all forms of human speech, maintained such an hypo-
thesis as the following, would be hard to refute.   Let there be
many allied species of the genus Homo ; let them be capable,
either within certain limits, or to an unlimited extent, of prolific
intermixture ; let one or more of these be characterized by the
possession of language, either to the absolute exclusion of the
rest, or the others having it in an imperfect and rudimentary con-
dition ; let intermixture take place in such a manner that the
species of the less perfect language become blended with the
species of the more perfect, etc.

Such a doctrine might fairly be said to account for many
somewhat difficult phenomena, and, at the same time, to be
beyond refutation.

Again,—let allied but different species construct their language
on the same principles, and, unless the original difference be too
great, there will be a certain amount of likeness wholly inde-
pendent of imitation.

Similar trains of reasoning against the ordinary inference
deducible from a fundamental unity of language could (if this
were the proper place for them) be pointed out.   The preceding,
however, stand as samples ; the position laid down in the text,
that the " use of languages really cognate is—a strong presump-
tion of kindred race" being correct.

SECTION II.

Nations of Europe at the earliest periods of history—Eastern origin of several proved by their languages—Indo-European languages—Is the Celtic allied to them?—Denied by several writers—Motives for the discussion of this question.

AT that era when the earliest dawning of history begins to dispel the mists which had hovered over the first ages of the world, we find the different races of people in Europe nearly in the same relative situations which they now occupy, and we can discern scarcely a trace, even in the oldest memorials, of those wanderings of tribes which may be supposed to have filled this region of the world with inhabitants. In the remotest quarters of Europe, towards the setting sun, we are told by Herodotus, that the Celtæ and Cynetæ dwelt about the sources of the Ister and the city—perhaps rather the mountains—of Pyrene, and it is unknown during how many ages they had occupied the region thus described, before the father of history obtained these earliest notices of them. It would seem, however, that before the Trojan war even Britain must have had inhabitants, since tin was at that time in use, which was brought from Britain by Phœnician traders.[a] We know likewise that the Teutonic

---

[a] This at least would appear from the account given by Herodotus of the Phœnician commerce.

nations inhabited the northern countries of Europe at a period not long subsequent to the age of Herodotus. Pytheas, the navigator of Marseilles, who was nearly contemporary with Aristotle, is well known to have made a voyage of discovery towards the north beyond the Pillars of Hercules, by far the most ancient that is recorded in that direction. In the course of this voyage he visited Britain, and even obtained some knowledge of Thule, or Iceland, and of the coast of the Baltic sea. Pytheas mentions the Guttones, who inhabited the shores of an estuary which must have been the mouth of the Vistula, and who carried on with their neighbours the Teutones a traffick in amber, a native production of their country.[b] The Teutones are well known under that name; the Guttones are probably the Goths; and thus we already discern in the north of Europe two of the most celebrated nations belonging to the Germanic family, in an age when even the name of Rome had scarcely become known to the Greeks.[6] The Finns and the Sclavonians are generally supposed to have been the latest among the great nations who formed the population of Europe.[7] But Finningia and the Fenni are mentioned by Tacitus and Pliny, who place them beyond

---

[b] " Pytheas Guttonibus Germaniæ genti accoli æstuarium oceani Mentonomon nomine spatio stadiorum : ab hoc diei navigatione insulam abesse Abalum : illo vere fluctibus advehi, et esse concreti maris purgamentum : incolas pro ligno ad ignem uti eo proximisque Teutonis vendere. Huic et Timæus credidit, sed insulam Baltiam vocavit." Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. xxxvii. cap. 2. The island of Abalus, or Baltia, may be Abo.

Germany and towards the Vistula. In the age of these writers the Finns were situated near the eastern parts of the Baltic, and had probably extended themselves already as far as those districts, where their descendants were known under the name of Beormahs or Biarmiers, in the times of Ohthere and St. Olaf. The Sclavonians, indeed, are not early distinguished in Europe under that name, but by the appellation of Wends, given to the Sclavonic race by the Germans, we recognise them in the geographical descriptions of Pliny and Tacitus, who mention the Venedi, and place them near the Finns, and on the borders of Finningia. There the Οὐενέδαι, or Winidæ, are stationed by Ptolemy and Jornandes, and the last of these writers appropriates expressly the name of Winidæ to the Sclavonic nations. It is besides highly probable that the Russians were known to Herodotus, and that they are mentioned by him under a term little varying from that which is now applied to the same people by their Finnish neighbours; for the Finns distinguish the Muscovites by the name of Rosso-lainen, or Russian people, and call themselves and nations of their own kindred Suoma-lainen. The word Rosso-lainen heard and written by a Greek would be Rhoxolani. The Rhoxolani, who are first described by Herodotus, are said in the age of Strabo to have inhabited the plains near the sources of the Tanais and the Borysthenes.

It appears, then, that the European races, in the

earliest periods in which we have any information respecting them, held nearly the same relative situations as the tribes of people who are chiefly descended from them still continue to occupy. Thus far the facts which history developes afford no evidence against the hypothesis, that different parts of the world were originally filled with indigenous inhabitants. It would be vain to attempt, merely from traits of resemblance in some customs or superstitions, or even from the doctrines of druidism and the mythology of the sagas, to ascribe a common origin to the nations of Europe and those of the East. By a similar mode of reasoning we might perhaps as well deduce the Turks and the Tartars from Arabia, and the Buddhists of northern Asia from India or Ceylon. Nor can historical traditions fill up the void. We can only hope by an analysis of the European languages to obtain a proof, that these races of people, having preserved common elements of speech, were connected in origin with the nations of Asia.

The languages of the Finnish nations, the Laplanders, the Hungarians, the Ostiaks, and other Siberian Tschudes, have been compared and carefully analysed by several German and other northern writers, particularly by Gyarmathi, Adelung, Gatterer, and Julius Klaproth. The result that appears to have been sufficiently established is, as I have elsewhere remarked, that all these nations sprang from one original. The primitive seat of this great

race of men, or rather the earliest station in which we can discover them by historical inquiries, is the country which lies between the chain of Caucasus and the southern extremities of the Uralian mountains.

But our chief concern at present is with the Indo-European tribes. That term was designed to include a class of nations, many of them inhabitants of Europe, whose dialects are more or less nearly related to the ancient language of India. This discovery was originally made by comparing the Sanskrit with the Greek and Latin. A very considerable number of words were found to be common to these languages, and a still more striking affinity was proved to exist between the grammatical forms respectively belonging to them. It is difficult to determine which idiom, the Latin or the Greek, approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit, but they are all evidently branches of one stem.

It was easily proved, that the Teutonic as well as the Sclavonian dialects, and the Lettish or Lithuanian which are in some respects intermediate between the former, stand nearly in the same relation to the ancient language of India.

Several intermediate languages, as the Zend and other Persian dialects, the Armenian and the Ossete, which is one of the various idioms spoken by the nations of Caucasus, have been supposed by writers who have examined their structure and etymology to belong to the same stock[c].[8]

[c] Klaproth, Asia Polyglotta.

Thus a near relation was proved to subsist between a considerable number of dialects spoken by nations who are spread over a great part of Europe and Asia. It may be remarked that the more accurate the examination of these languages has been, the more extensive and deeply rooted their affinity has been discovered to be. Those who are acquainted with Professor Jacob Grimm's able and lucid Analysis of the Teutonic idioms, will fully admit the truth of this remark. The historical inference hence deduced is, that the European nations, who speak dialects referrible to this class of languages, are of the same race with the Indians and other Asiatics to whom the same observation may be applied; and this conclusion seems to have been admitted by writers who in general have displayed little indulgence towards the visionary speculations of philologists.[d]

[d] The Edinburgh Reviewers, in a late critique, to which the observation in the text may particularly be applied, have remarked : " We are free to confess that the result of our inquiries has been to produce a conviction in our minds that the affinities known to subsist between the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and German languages are perfectly irreconcilable with any other supposition than that of their having all been derived from a common source or primitive language spoken by a people of whom the Indians, Greeks, Latins, and Germans were equally the descendants." Ed. Rev. No. 102, p. 562. Baron Cuvier has admitted the same inference as far as it relates to the Indians and the Greeks, which is equivalent to its general admission. He says, "The Pelasgi were originally from India, of which the Sanskrit roots that occur abundantly in their language *do not permit us to doubt.* It is probable that by crossing the mountains of Persia they penetrated as far as the Caucasus; and that from this point, instead of continuing their route by land, they embarked on the Black Sea, and made a descent upon the coasts of Greece." In another passage of the same lecture, M. Cuvier observes, "that the Sanskrit language is the most regular that is known, and that it is especially remarkable for the circumstance that it contains the roots of the various languages of Europe, of

The inquiry has frequently been made, whether the Celtic dialects belong to the class of languages thus allied, for which the term Indo-European is the most suitable designation. The question is an interesting one, because it has a particular bearing on the origin of the nations of Western Europe, including the British Isles, as well as a more extensive one on the physical history of mankind. We have to inquire whether the same arguments which prove most of the other nations in this quarter of the world to have sprung from an eastern origin, may also be applied to that stock whose branches at the earliest period of history were spread over Gaul and Britain, and a part of Spain. Writers on the history of languages and the antiquity of nations have been divided with respect to this question. Adelung and Murray have regarded the Celtic as a branch of the Indo-European stock. But the latter of these writers has passed over the subject in a very cursory manner, or rather, he has left that part of his work which relates to the Celtic dialects in an incomplete state. And Adelung, who has been followed in this particular by many foreign writers, has committed the error of supposing the Welsh tongue to be a descendant from the language of the Belgæ, and not from that of the Celtæ, who inhabited the central parts of Gaul, and, as it is generally supposed, of Britain.[9] A want of access

the Greek, Latin, German, and Sclavonic." (Baron Cuvier's Lectures on the Natural Sciences.) He has omitted the Celtic nations, the earliest inhabitants of Western Europe, and perhaps regards them as aborigines.

to information respecting the Celtic dialects has
prevented the learned men of Germany from form-
ing correct opinions on their relations to each other,
and hence it has arisen, that this department in the
history of languages—a subject which has been
principally investigated by German writers—still
remains but imperfectly elucidated. Many of the
continental writers, among whom may be mentioned
Frederick Schlegel and Malte Brun, seem to have
believed the Celtic to be a language of a distinct
class, entirely unconnected with the other idioms
of Europe; and in England the same opinion has
been expressed by several well-known authors. Mr.
Pinkerton has declared in the most positive terms
that the Celtæ were a people entirely distinct from
the rest of mankind. He says that their language,
" the real Celtic, is as remote from the Greek as the
Hottentot from the Lapponic." " The mythology of
the Celtæ," adds Mr. Pinkerton, " resembled, in all
probability, that of the Hottentots, or others the
rudest savages, as the Celtæ anciently were, and are
little better at present, being incapable of any pro-
gress in society." A late writer, in a work of
extensive research, at the conclusion of a chapter,
in which he has refuted some of the opinions of
Pelloutier and Bullet with respect to the Celtæ and
their language, thus sums up the general result of
his inquiries[e]:—" With regard," he says, " to the

---

[e] Researches into the Origin and Affinity of the principal Languages of
Asia and Europe, by Lieut.-Col. Vans Kennedy, etc. London, 1828, p. 85.

languages of Asia, "I may adopt the words of Davis in the preface to his Dictionary, after substituting the word *nullam* for *manifestam.* 'Ausim affirmare linguam Britannicam (Celticam) tum vocibus, tum phrasibus et orationis contextu, tum literarum pronunciatione, nullam cum orientalibus habere congruentiam et affinitatem.' [f] The Celtic, therefore," continues the same writer, "when divested of all words which have been introduced into it by conquest and religion, is a perfectly original language : but this originality incontrovertibly proves that neither Greek, Latin, or the Teutonic dialects, nor Arabic, Persian, or Sanskrit, were derived from the Celtic, since these languages have not any affinity whatever with that tongue."

In the first edition of my Researches into the Physical History of Mankind, which was published in 1813, fifteen years before the work from which the preceding extract has been taken, I ventured to make the following statement on this subject, the result of what appeared to myself an adequate examination :—

"We have remarked above that there is historical proof of the connexion of the Sclavonian, German, and Pelasgian races with the ancient Asiatic nations. Now the languages of these races and the Celtic, although differing much from each

---

[f] "I dare to affirm that the British or Celtic language has no connection or affinity with the languages of the East, either in words, or phrases, or the construction of sentences, or the pronunciation of letters."

other, and constituting the four principal depart-
ments of dialects which prevail in Europe, are yet
so far allied in their radical elements, that we may
with certainty pronounce them to be branches of
the same original stock.   The resemblance is re-
markable in the general structure of speech, and in
those parts of the vocabulary which must be sup-
posed to be the most ancient, as in words descrip-
tive of common objects and feelings, for˜ which
expressive terms existed in the primitive ages of
society.   We must therefore infer, that the nations
to whom these languages belonged emigrated from
the same quarter." [g]

The extent which my work necessarily assumed,
and the apparent incongruity of filling up any con-
siderable part of a physiological essay with glossaries
or remarks on grammatical forms, combined with
other reasons in preventing me from entering at full
into the proof of these assertions, and the same cir-
cumstances operated likewise at the publication of
the second edition.   I have, however, had the sub-
ject occasionally in view during the interval, and
have collected from time to time materials for a
treatise upon it, which many circumstances have at

---

[g] Researches, etc., p. 534.   The following note was appended to this
passage :—

"The author of the review of Wilkins's Sanskrit Grammar, in the thir-
teenth volume of the Edinburgh Review, has given a comparative vocabulary
of the Sanskrit, Persic, Latin, and German languages, which completely
evinces the truth of the position here affirmed, as far as the above languages
are concerned.   But the proof would have been more striking, if he had
added the Celtic dialects and the Greek.   I have made an attempt to supply
this deficiency, which I intend to make public."

length determined me to lay before the public. Among these may be mentioned the decided opinion advanced in the work from which I have above cited a passage, proving, unless I am mistaken, that there is not yet sufficient information before the public on a subject of considerable moment in respect to the history of the human race, and the relation of its various branches to each other. Another motive to this determination has been the advice of some learned friends with whom I have conversed on the subject of the following treatise, and particularly of the two highly distinguished men to whom it is dedicated.

The main object which I have had in view in the composition of this work has been to institute such a comparison of the Celtic dialects with the languages allowed to belong to the Indo-European stock, as may tend to illustrate the relation of the Celtic people to the rest of mankind. In the course, however, of this inquiry, I have incidentally discovered that the relations between the languages above mentioned and the Celtic, is such as not merely to establish the affinity of the respective nations, but likewise to throw light upon the structure of the Indo-European languages in general, and particularly to illustrate some points of obscurity, to which many writers on grammar and etymology have adverted without fully elucidating them. The following pages will contain such remarks as I have thought requisite on this point of view.

NOTES TO SECTION II.

(6). *Pytheas.*—That Pytheas met with Germans on the shores of either the Baltic, or the northern parts of the German Ocean, is nearly certain. If he did not do this, he at least met with populations who came in contact with Germans. Whether the evidence of the text prove this is another question. I hold that it does not.

1. It is by no means certain that the text of Pliny makes the Teutons the neighbours to the Guttones. Instead of being rendered the " near Germans," it may mean the " Germans who are nearest." These may be very distant.

2. As little is it certain that the Teutons of Pliny were Germans. In the eyes of the earlier writers of the empire, the word Teuton meant "belonging to the same family as the Teutones conquered by Marius." Who they were was not exactly known. At first they seem to have been considered Gauls ; but when Gaul became better known, as it was in the time of Julius Cæsar, and no Teutons, *eo nomine*, appeared therein, it became necessary to look for them further north. In Strabo's time they passed for Germans; yet, even in Germany, *eo nomine*, no Teutons were ever found. Hence it is neither certain that all the writers who used the word Teuton meant thereby a native of Germany, nor that those who meant that were correct in their notions.

3. The chief reason, however, for the widely-spread doctrine that the Teutones were Germans, is the fact of the modern German being called Deutsch, Dutch, Tydske, etc. Whatever be the forms this name takes, it gives us the root *Teut-*; since the *sch*, *ch*, *ske*, etc., are neither more nor less than the *-ish* in words like *self-ish.* If so, *Dutch = Teut-on.*

Plausible as this looks at first, it is the very worst reason that can be given. The word *Dutch* could never have existed in the time of the *Teutones*, any more than the words *Vulgar Tongue* could have existed at the same time. *Diot-* means *people*, *diot-isc* means *popular*, and when the vernacular language of the Germans (as it did *after* the introduction of Christianity) came to be contrasted with the language of Rome, the *Dutch* or *popular* tongue came to be contrasted with the Literary, or Latin. How then could the *Teutones* have been *Dutch* in the time of Marius, long before such a contrast existed?

4. Upon the words *Germaniæ genti* no great stress can be laid. The Germania of even Tacitus, who wrote much more precisely than did Pliny, contained populations who, in our eyes, would not be Germans. The Æstyii are specially stated to have spoken a language other than German. Now no two populations, bearing different names, can more legitimately be identified with each other than these Æstyii with the very Guttones under notice. Both names belonged to the amber country, and we shall soon see that special reasons can be given for believing that they were both borne by the same tribes.

These are points, however, which, in present criticism, are but briefly noticed. They have been considered fully, and perhaps over-fully, in more than one work of the present writer's, especially in his ethnological edition of the Germania of Tacitus. Nor, indeed, are they of fundamental importance here; the main fact that Dr. Prichard insists on, viz. that at the beginning of the historical period the nations of Europe occupied the same relative situations which they occupy at the present time, being correct.

There *were* Germans on the Baltic; though it may not be the text of Pliny upon which the belief in their existence best rests. There is a single word in Strabo, which, pointing to the earliest visitors of that sea, has, in the eyes of the philological ethnologist, the same value that a single fossil, in an otherwise obscure formation, has in those of the geologist. It is the word Ωςιαῖοι, which is, doubtless, neither more nor less than *Æst-yii* (the form in Tacitus), which is the German *East*, even as it is in the present terms, *Esthen*, *Est-land*, etc. = *Estonia*. The men who speak, in the nineteenth century, of certain eastern populations of the Baltic as *Este*, must be the descendants, in speech at least, of the men who, in the time of Tacitus, called the

same *Este* by the name *Æstyii*, and, in the time of Pytheas, Ωςιαῖοι. Whether they meant the same people, is another question. Probably they did not; they simply meant some one *east* of themselves. These might be the occupants of the modern Estonia, but they might also be the occupants of East Prussia and Courland; as they probably were. At the present time the English district of Northumberland begins at the Tyne. In the time of Alfred it began at the Humber, as its name denotes.

(7). *The* FINS *supposed to have been the latest amongst the great nations who formed the population of Europe.—The (so-called) Fin Hypothesis.*—Since this was written a great change has come over the doctrine concerning the Fins; a change which has given inordinate and unexpected prominence to an otherwise obscure population. By *Fin* is meant not only the Finlander of Finland, but a great deal more. All the populations whose languages belong to the same class are, in the eyes of the ethnologist, Fins. Now these languages are the following :—

The Lap of the Laplanders.—That the Laps were Fins would never have been doubted had it not been for the difference between the two populations in respect to their physical conformation. This was considered sufficiently great to indicate the propriety of great caution in the comparison of the other signs of ethnological affinity. And, consequently, it was not until the investigations had become close, minute, and searching, that, in the matter of both grammar and words, the place of the Lap language amongst the other members of the Fin class was unreservedly admitted. The proper Fin has a great number of cases—no less than fifteen. The Lap was long supposed to have no more than eight or nine. Rask, however, shewed that several forms which appeared in Fin as the cases of nouns, could, with a little care, be detected in Lap, under the guise of adverbs. At the present moment, when few languages of equal political and literary unimportance are better known or more carefully studied than the Lap, there is no division of opinion on the question as to their place in the Fin class.

The Magyar of Hungary.—The Fin affinities of this interesting language have been doubted, and, by some, they are doubted even now. The objections, however, appear to rest on patriotic rather than scientific grounds; the Magyars

themselves being by no means flattered by a connection with tribes so inferior to themselves in civilization and physical development as the Laplanders. Consequently, affinities of a different character have been set up by more than one Magyar scholar. Sometimes a Circassian, at others a Tibetan, pedigree has been claimed. The Fin alliance, however, which was pointed out by two able philologues of the last century— Sainovics and Gyarmathi—and which is recognised, though not without a certain amount of reserve, by the author of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, is not to be set aside. No competent judge, of other than Magyar origin, denies it; but, on the contrary, all admit it expressly—Klaproth, Adelung, Prichard, etc.

The Estonian of Estonia. — With this, as with all the forthcoming populations, there is neither doubt nor difficulty. No one has denied their affinities with one another, nor yet their affinities with the Fins of Finland. As a branch of the Estonians, we may add—

The Liefs, a population of about 2,100 souls. They gave their name to the Government of *Livonia* (*Lief*-land). Nevertheless there are, at the present moment, not above twenty-five or thirty on Livonian soil. The others are in Courland.

The Vod.—These are the descendants of the original occupants of Ingria; a population which, anterior to the Swedish and Russian conquests on the coasts of the Gulph of Finland, joined the Fins of the Duchy of Finland, and the Rahwas (for that is their national name) of Estonia. The number of Vod is abo 5,000.

> *The Permians and Zirianians*, of the Governments of Vologda and Permia.
> *The Votiaks*, of the Governments of Viatka, Kazan, etc.
> *The Tsheremis*, of the Governments of Viatka, Kazan, Kostroma, Nizhni-novogorod, Orenburg, and Perm.
> *The Morduins*, of the Governments of Astrakhan, Kazan, etc.
> *The Tshuwash*, of the Governments of Kazan, Simbirsk, etc.

All these, belonging to Russia in Europe, form but part of the stock of the great Finn family, which contains in Asia—

> *The Voguls*, of the Uralian range; and
> *The Ostiaks*, of the drainage of Obi.

The *Samoyed*, *Yeniseian*, and *Yukahiri* languages are additions to the Fin family of recent origin. All the other members have

been long recognised. It may be added that the stock itself is as
often called *Ugrian* as Fin.

Out of the Fin stock of languages grew what may be called
the *Fin hypothesis*. It originated (I believe) with Arndt, but
was developed and promulgated by Rask. It was adopted at
once by the Scandinavian philologues and ethnologists, to whose
speculations it has given a character by which they are honor-
ably distinguished. It has given boldness and comprehensive-
ness, at the very least.   In his first edition of the English
Language, the present writer adopted it, along with more than
one other doctrine, which he has since found reason either to
modify or abandon. He believes, too, that, thus adopted, it
found its way into England for the first time. The German
school appears to recognise it generally. In France and America
it has made less way. Dr. Prichard, in his second edition of the
Natural History of Man, adopts it; using, however, the term
Allophylian instead of Fin or Ugrian. In the work before us
(as we see) he does not seem to be aware of it.

The Fin hypothesis is closely connected with the Eastern
origin of the Indo-Europeans ; the Eastern origin of the Indo-
Europeans being essential to its validity. Without the Fin
hypothesis, the Eastern origin, etc., is possible ; but, without the
Eastern origin, there is no Fin hypothesis. This helps us on
towards an anticipation of its nature.

If the Indo-Europeans came from the East, and if they were
not the very first occupants of the West, some one must have
been in Europe before them. When they were on the Indus,
the Tigris, and the Euphrates, others must have been on the Rhine,
the Danube, and the Rhone, possibly on the Thames, possibly on
the Ebro and the Guadalquivir. More than this—Asia is a large
area, and it is not from any part of it indifferently that this
hypothesis brings the Indo-Europeans. They were not Siberians
nor Chinese ; possibly they were at one time foreign to even
certain parts of India. There are in India impracticable forests,
mountains, and jungles. Besides this, India stretches far south-
wards ; so that a population might easily be occupant of the
Ganges and Indus without reaching Cape Comorin—possibly
without having got south of the Nerbudda, Godavery, or Kistna
rivers.

Be this as it may, there was a vast area which, at one time,
was neither uninhabited, nor yet inhabited by Indo-Europeans.

Who *did* occupy it? By the hypothesis of Arndt and Rask, the Fins. Hence the Fin hypothesis.

It is, of course, not meant by this that the several populations which thus resided aboriginally in the plains of Sarmatia, the mountains of Italy and Spain, the islands of Britain, the steppes of Siberia, and the inaccessible extremities of the Indian Peninsula—to say nothing of China and Siam—were Fins in the way that the true members of the stock in its narrower (and proper) sense were Fins. It is merely meant that they were more related to each other than they were to either the Indo-Europeans or any other recognised class.

Nevertheless, the group was one of formidable dimensions. First, it contained populations in the south and west of Europe, who, being other than Indo-European, took the appearance of being aboriginal. Some of them were extinct. Others, however, survived. The Basks of the Pyrenees did this. So did the Albanians of Albania. These survived, because the inaccessible nature of their areas had preserved them from the fate of their congeners in Gaul, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Sarmatia. They survived, because woods and mountains had been to them what the cold of the Arctic Circle had been to the Laps, and his swamps and fens to the Finlander. They survived to suggest to ethnologists of the nineteenth century a time (long anterior to the dawn of history) when a complex series of kindred populations was continuously spread over all Europe, from Albania to Finland, from Spain to Scandinavia—a series of populations now broken up and separated.

Secondly, it contained populations to the north and west of the original home of the Indo-Europeans; for it seems to have been in the direction of Europe, rather than in that of either China or Siberia, that the great hypothetical stream of the Indo-European population rolled itself. These were the Chinese and the tribes of Siberia.

Thirdly, it contained those populations of India itself, whose language betokened a different origin from that of the populations whose ancestors spoke Sanskrit. These were the nations of the Dekhan, and most of the hill-tribes.

In this way the Fin hypothesis pointed to a time when a small portion of Asia, destined to give origin to the Sarmatian, German, Latin, and Greek conquerors of Europe, as well as to those occupants of Hindostan who spoke the Sanskrit language,

was surrounded by a population destined to give way to the stronger, nobler, and more dominant tribes that issued there-from—these latter agreeing with each other, more or less, in language and other characteristics. I say other characteristics, because the fact of their having so generally given way before their invaders went for one. Neither was it long before anatomists discovered that the crania from the very oldest *tumuli* of Britain, Gaul, and Germany, were Lap or Fin in form; and, as such, indicative of a population other and earlier than the present Indo-Europeans.

We may well then speak of the Fin hypothesis. There are many illustrations of it, both in history and philology. As a general rule, the populations which it claimed were of slight historical importance. Two only out of the whole class were rulers on the face of the earth—the Ottoman Turks and the Chinese, and there are plenty of predictions about *them*.

If a philologue were also a geologist, he had, in the primary and secondary formations, an apt illustration of the two great layers of population in Europe. There was the Fin substratum, once ubiquitous and continuous, but now overlaid by more recent strata, yet showing itself, after the fashion of granite mountains, in isolated areas.

So much in the way of illustration of the Fin hypothesis. It was the idea of a man of great genius, and it was eminently suggestive to others. It taught philologues where to look for the congeners of languages apparently isolated. When the nearest ally of the Bask of the Pyrenees was the Lap of Lapland, and when one of its strongest contrasts was to be found in the French and Spanish, with which it was in immediate geographical con-tact, it was easy to see that similar relations might exist else-where. Pass over the area into which a foreign tongue has intruded, and look for affinities on the spot where the older tongue reappears. This was the rule suggested, and it was a rule of great value, and rich in results.

If the Fin hypothesis were even more exceptionable as a matter of fact than it really is, its promulgation would, never-theless, have been a benefit to ethnographical philology.

Is it then wrong as a matter of fact? The present writer commits himself to the doctrine that it is wrong. Why? Because he holds against the Eastern origin of the Indo-Europeans.

The reasons for this doctrine are given in the sequel; the

object of the present note being to explain the nature of the hypothesis in question, and to show its relation to the cognate hypothesis as to the Eastern origin, etc.

If the Indo-Europeans have originated in Europe, the original continuity of the Fin area can no longer be maintained.

That the true Fin area, however, at one time was much wider than it is now, is certain. This, however, is a mere question of degree.

The Slavonians are generally supposed to have been the latest amongst the great nations who formed the populations of Europe. — The doctrine that the Slavonians are amongst the latest emigrants into Europe, is part and parcel of the Indo-European hypothesis. Of all the Indo-Europeans they are the most eastern. In this we find a plausible reason for believing them to be the newest comers.

Again, it is safe to say that an opinion to the effect that the Slavonic tongues and the Sanskrit are not merely allied to each other, but *more closely allied* than the other members of their class, is gaining ground. If so, what more natural than to make the Russian and Polish, etc., the most Asiatic of the tongues of Europe?

The objections that lie against this view, are to be found further on.

In the way of detail, an exception may be taken to the statement concerning the Rhoxolani.

They are not mentioned, *eo nomine*, by Herodotus.

Herodotus may, or may not, in describing certain populations of Scythia and Sarmatia, have described Rhoxolani. There is no evidence, however, of his having done so.

Rhoxolani is probably a Fin word, but not certainly. The fact of the termination in *n* being a singular form, is somewhat against it. *Ruotsolainen = a Russian*, the word for *Russians* being *Ruotsolaiset*. So also—

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
Suomalai*nen = a Fin.*	Suomalai*set = Fins.*
Hamalai*nen = a Fin.*	Hamalai*set = Fins.*

Rhoxolani is a word that a Fin might apply to the Russians. But he might also apply it to populations other than Russian. In fact, at the present moment, he actually does apply it to the Swedes.

Rhoxolani, even if it be a Fin gloss, need not be so to the

whole extent of the word.   The root *Rhox-* (*Ruots-*, *Ross-*) may belong to one language, the termination *-lani* to another.

Supposing it, however, to be wholly Fin, all that the existence of the word really proves is — that, in the time of Strabo, certain Fins, or Ugrians, were sufficiently near those portions of the coasts of the Black Sea that the Greeks visited, for words belonging to their language to reach the informants of either Strabo or his authorities.   More than this we cannot legitimately get.   This, however, is of value.   It gives a fact connected with the southern extension of the Fin area in the first century A.D.

Further remarks on this word may be found in the author's Native Races of the Russian Empire, p. 223.

As for the historical details of the Rhoxolani, they "first appear about a century before Christ, when they were found occupying the steppes between the *Dnieper* and the *Don*. Afterwards, some of them made their footing in Dacia, and behind the Carpathians.   Strabo has told the story of the defeat of the Roxolani and their leader, Iasius, by Diophantus, the general of Mithridates, and takes the opportunity of describing some of their manners, which resembled those of the Sarmatian stock to which they belonged.   Tacitus mentions another defeat of this people, when making an inroad into Moesia during Otho's short lease of power.   From the inscription which records the honours paid to Plautius Silvanus, it appears that they were also defeated by him.   Hadrian, who kept their frontier quiet by subsidising the needy tribes, when they complained about the payment, came to terms with their king.   When the rising broke out among the Sarmatian, German, and Scythian tribes, from the Rhine to the Tanais, in the reign of M. Aurelius, the Rhoxolani were included in the number.   With the inroads of the Goths, the name of the Roxolani almost disappears."   Dr. W. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, voc. ROXOLANI.

(8). *The Armenian and Ossete considered to be Indo-European. —The Zend and Persian forms of speech.*—The Zend, or language of the Zoroastrian Scriptures, is, undoubtedly, a language belonging to the same class with the Sanskrit, to which it is closely allied. This is a point upon which there is neither doubt nor shadow of doubt.   The relations, however, of the Zend to the modern Persian are by no means equally decided.   General opinion is

in favour of them.   There are several points, however, which re-
quire settlement before the matter is decided.   The Zend
is a language rich in inflections.   The modern Persian has
as few as the English.   Hence the inference that it stands in
the same relation to the language of the Zendavesta as the
English does to the Anglo-Saxon, the Italian to the Latin, etc.
It is possible, however, that this resemblance may be accidental.
Languages may be destitute of inflection for two reasons.   Pre-
viously existing inflections may have been lost, or no inflection
may ever have been developed.   This is the case with the
Chinese.   If the Greek had been introduced into China a thou-
sand years ago; if Greek inscriptions were common in China;
if the old Chinese ritual were Greek; and, finally, if during the
period of Greek occupancy a great per-centage of Greek words
had been taken-up into the Chinese tongue, the latter would
wear the appearance of being a derivative of the former, which
it is not.

Now I am not aware that the possibility of the non-inflexional
character of the modern Persian being due to non-development
rather than to loss has ever been recognised.   At any rate, the
alternative suggested by the foregoing remarks has never been
closely investigated.   Hence the deduction of the modern
Persian from the Zend requires more evidence than it has
found.

The Armenian is but little known to comparative philologues.
It is known to many learned Armenians, but none of these are
ethnological critics.   Its place in the Indo-European class has,
therefore, been taken upon trust.   A few points of resemblance
have been adduced.   So have certain statements in the way of
external testimony.

The Armenian verb-substantive runs *yem, yes, yest*, giving
forms remarkably like *sum, es, est;* a fact noticed by Müller in his
history of the Dorians, wherein considerable prominence is given
to this language.   There is also the word *viur* = πῦρ = *fire*.

Again—in Klaproth's Asia Polyglotta, a vast number of words
are common to the Armenian and to the other Indo-European
tongues.   We must remember, however, that, in that work, the
term Indo-European (Indo-Germanic) comprises the Persian, to
which exceptions have been, and the Ossete, to which exceptions
will be, taken.

As to the forms in *m*, they are common in languages remote

from the Indo-European. At the same time, the forms in ques-
tion must be admitted to be favourable to the view they are meant
to support.

The chief objection against the Armenian being Indo-European
lies in the fact of its having affinities with more than one of the
languages of Caucasus and the neighbouring countries, which no
legitimate classification has ever made, or is likely to make, Indo-
European.

More upon this point will be said in the sequel.

The Ossete is Indo-European much as the Armenian is. It
has a great number of words common to that language and the
Persian—words which make the tongue in which they appear
Indo-European, provided the other languages are so.

The Ossete verbs form their persons after the fashion of the
Armenian—a fashion which is Latin, Greek, English, etc. But
(as aforesaid) the letter *m* as the sign of the first person is com-
mon all the world over; the similarity in the other persons being
less decided.

On the other hand, many proper Slavonic words appear in
the Ossete.

Mutatis mutandis, the statement just made concerning the
Armenian applies here. The Ossete cannot be disconnected from
the other tongues of its neighbourhood. Be it so. Why may not
they be Indo-European ? This is an alternative that not only may
be legitimately proposed, but it is one which has actually been
adopted and maintained. Professor Bopp has devoted more than
one paper to proving that the Georgian is what the Ossete is,
the latter being Indo-European.

The present writer agrees with the former part of this line of
argument, denying the latter. In other words, he reverses the
doctrine. The Ossete is what the Georgian is, *i.e.* other than
Indo-European.

For several reasons the Ossete has commanded an extraor-
dinary amount of attention. Its (real or supposed) Indo-Euro-
pean character is one point of interest. The native name is
another. This is *Irôn*. So the Ossetes call themselves; a word
which points to Iran or Persia, and this raises the ideas con-
nected with the important term Iranian. A doctrine, enunciated
by Klaproth, has helped to magnify it. It is to the effect that
the Irôn represent the ancient Medes, a colony of whom was
placed in Caucasus. Again, the same Irôn were descendants of

the Alani. Reasons for considering all this as unsound have been given by the present writer elsewhere.

The present Irôn has been but lately reduced to writing. Hence, whilst the Armenian has one native alphabet and the Georgian another, the Ossete is written in Russian characters—the Ossete tribes being Christianized and Russianized.

They are mountaineers of the central parts of Caucasus. A line drawn north of Tiflis leads into their country.

There are, at least, two dialects of their language; which has been illustrated by Klaproth in the Asia Polyglotta, by Rosen in a special dissertation, and by Sjögren, to whom the publication of an Irôn dictionary (in the Russian letters aforesaid) is due.

(9). *Adelung and Murray have regarded the Celtic as a branch of the Indo-European stock.*—This must not be interpreted to mean that either of the writers just named make either the Keltic or anything else Indo-European *eo nomine.*

Neither the term Indo-Germanic nor Indo-European is used by Adelung. So far as the Keltic is subordinated to any higher denomination it is *European*—but *European* in the Mithridates is merely a geographical term, meaning *spoken in Europe.* The Bask is in the same category. In the order of arrangement it precedes the Keltic; the German following it.

The sections on the Keltic are far from the soundest parts of the Mithridates; the most exceptional portions of them being the parts that relate to the British branch.

In the first volume published in 1809, no account is given of the Manx. In the supplementary volume of 1819, this omission is rectified.

The word Kelt, itself, is taken by Adelung as it is found in the Latin and Greek writers; Gaul being their original Keltic seat; Italy, Pannonia, and Asia Minor, as well as the British Isles, being parts to which its occupants spread themselves. In Gaul, however, their area is limited. The Aquitanians confine them on the south; the Ligurians on the south-east. All this is as the classical writers make it.

The Belgæ the author makes Kelto-Germans; and connects them with the Cimbri, the doctrine running thus—

That part of northern Gaul which Cæsar gave to the Belgæ, though originally Keltic, came to be invaded by certain tribes from Germany. These styled themselves *Kimri,* or, as the

Romans wrote the word, *Cimbri*. They settled themselves in Gaul as an aristocracy amongst a population whom they reduced, with whom they intermarried, and into whose language they infused so considerable a tincture of their own, as to make the result a mixed or hybrid form of speech. This was the Belgic; for Belgæ was the name by which the Gauls designated the Cimbri.

Some time—perhaps not very long—before the time of Cæsar, these Belgic Cimbri, German in some points, Kelt in others, invaded Britain, until then an Erse or Gaelic country, and occupied certain portions thereof, until (themselves invaded by the Romans), they retired to Wales, and thence to Brittany.

If so, the *whole* of the British Isles was originally Gaelic. If so, the language of Southern and Central Gaul was, more or less, Gaelic also. If so, the so-called British branch of the Keltic stock has no existence as a separate substantive form of speech, being merely a mixture. If so, the Belgic, Kimbric, Cambrian, or whatever else it may be in the way of name, is, in reality, Kelto-German rather than pure Kelt.

And this is what the writer actually makes it; the third section of the second part being headed "*Keltisch-Germanischer oder Kimbrischer Sprachstamm.*"

SECTION III.

IT may be doubted whether the term *Celtic languages* is the most proper epithet for the class of idioms generally designated, and which I shall continue, in compliance with custom, to designate by that name. The Celtæ, properly so called, were a people of Gaul. Of their language we have no undoubted specimen. There are, indeed, strong grounds for believing that it was a kindred tongue with the dialects of the British isles ; but it would be better to take the general name of a whole class of languages from something that actually remains.

There are six dialects of the language termed Celtic which may be said to survive, as five are still spoken, and one of them, viz., the Cornish, is sufficiently preserved in books. These six dialects are, the Welsh, the Cornish, the Armorican, the Irish or Erse, the Gaelic or Highland-Scottish, and the Manks. The three former are relics of the idiom of the ancient Britons ; the three latter, of that spoken by the inhabitants of Ireland. We have historical evidence[a] that the Britons of Armorica,

---

[a] Chiefly in the works of Gregory of Tours and Eginhardt. I have surveyed the evidence on this subject in my Researches into the Physical History of Mankind.

the Britanni of Gregory of Tours, emigrated from Britain, through the whole extent [10] of which, with the exception of some parts of the southern coast, where the Belgæ from Gaul had settled, it is probable that one language prevailed at the era of the Roman conquest.[b]   Of this language the three dialects of Wales, Cornwall, and Lower Brittany are descendants.   Of the Irish language, the Scottish Gaelic is a slight modification : the Manks differs more considerably, and it is probable that the Isle of Man had inhabitants from this branch of the Celtic stock long before the emigration of the Scots from Ireland to the coast of Argyle.

I shall in general take the Welsh as a specimen of the Britannic dialects, and the Erse, or old Irish, as an example of the other class; but I shall add occasionally words or forms which exist in the subordinate dialects, and are lost, or have become less distinct, in either of the principal ones.

I have experienced some difficulty in adopting a regular method in the orthography of Celtic words. The modern system of representing consonants in the Welsh and the Erse languages is so remote from the usage of other tongues, that I have thought it advisable to deviate from it in some instances.   In the former I have occasionally followed the orthography of Edward Lhuyd, in preference to that which is sanctioned by the authority of the Welsh

---

[b] That the Caledonians had this language has been proved by Chalmers and Ritson.

translators of the Bible. The grounds for this pre-
ference will appear obviously in the particular in-
stances in which it has been made, to those who are
acquainted with the Welsh language and its pro-
nunciation, and other readers will have no reason to
complain of a method which will guide them to the
proper utterance of words, when it would otherwise
have escaped them. In the Irish orthography,
which can scarcely be said to have any fixed stan-
dard, I have followed the best authorities within
my reach. In the orthography of Sanskrit words
I have deviated but little from the system proposed
by Sir William Jones. In some few instances,
however, which will be obvious to those who are
acquainted with that method, I have endeavoured
to approach more nearly to the habit of our own
language.[c]

[c] I have followed Mr. Yates in substituting for the four Sanskrit diphthongs,
ए, ऐ, ओ, औ, the following, *ai*, *oi*, *ó*, *au*. There being some uncertainty
as to the exact pronunciation of vowels in ancient languages, it seems allowable
to use those vowels as representatives of each other, which in fact generally
are found in corresponding words, provided this method is not used in such a
manner as to produce an appearance of resemblance in words which are not
in reality cognate.

NOTES TO SECTION III.

(10). *Britons of Armorica.*—The doctrine that the Bretons of Armorica are descendants from certain Britons of Britain, who, at the break-up of the Roman authority in the island, passed over to Armorica, has undergone some remarkable changes. The external evidence to the fact is insufficient. Eginhardt wrote more than four hundred years after the date assigned to the event; Beda, who is not mentioned in the text, three hundred. Gregory of Tours lived nearer to the period in question. He also lived closer to the area upon which the migration was made. Nevertheless, his statement dates more than a century after its epoch.

Practically, then, there is no satisfactory testimony at all. More than this, there are special reasons for distrusting the evidence we have. The writer who knew that on the two sides of the British Channel one and the same language was spoken, and that in both cases this language was British, would have been either far behind or far before his cotemporaries, had he failed to account for it by a migration. Either the Welsh would come from Armorica, or the Armoricans from Wales.

I hold, then, that what we are in the habit of looking upon as testimony, is no testimony at all, but only so much inference.

If so, and if there were no Welsh conquest of Brittany, the Breton, as it is now spoken, represents the ancient language of Gaul—Brittany being a portion of that country that maintained its language against the Romans, just as Wales did in Britain;

both being impracticable, and, comparatively speaking, inaccessible districts.

There is, however, one difficulty connected with this view ; a difficulty I by no means undervalue. Neither (as we shall see anon) have others.

The best evidence to the amount of likeness or difference between the Welsh and Breton, is to the following effect. Let two *uneducated* individuals, one a Welshman, and the other a Breton, converse, and it is nearly certain that they shall be mutually unintelligible, especially if either be at all provincial in the utterance, or the subject require an admixture of French words on one side, or English on the other. In this case, the languages are *two*.

Let, however, two educated men, prepared for finding similarities, and framing their language accordingly, partly by choosing a simple subject, and partly by omitting foreign words, hold intercourse, and the languages become *one; i.e.* the two speakers can mutually understand each other.

Such being the case, the likeness between the two tongues becomes apparent. It is greater, however, than what it should be if the languages were separated from each other for so long a period as the doctrine that the Breton is of Gallic origin requires. On the other hand, it is, there or thereabouts, the amount of difference that the fourteen hundred years between the expulsion of the Romans from Britain and the present time would make probable. In short, if the Bretons and Welsh were separated from one another *ab initio*, the difference should be greater than it is.

On the other hand, languages change at different rates—some quickly, some slowly, some very slowly. Why may not the Breton and Welsh have been the slowest amongst the slow.

A very clear and critical investigator of these matters, ignoring the so-called evidence that deduces the Bretons from Wales, and, at the same time, thoroughly recognising the complications engendered by the over-great likeness between the Welsh and Armorican, has suggested a reversal of the old doctrine, and derived the Welsh from Brittany. England he believes to have been, under the dominion of the Romans, wholly Roman. Wales he believes to have been as Roman as England. Both he believes to have been deserted, or, at least, left defenceless. Both he believes to have been ravaged, and, subsequently,

occupied by piratical invaders from the continent. Of these, however, he makes the Angles only a portion. *They* occupied the eastern and northern counties. Meanwhile, the Bretons of Armorica reduced Wales.

For the fuller exposition of this view, see *Mr. Wright in Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire,* vol. viii.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER.

THE KELTIC NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY.

SECTION I.

THE TERM KELTIC—GALATÆ AND GALLI.

THE author who first uses the word *Kelt* is Herodotus, after whose time the term appears as often as the subject gives us reason to expect it in the Greek writers in general—in the Greek, but not in the Latin. The Latins used another term; not, indeed, to the absolute exclusion of the word *Celtæ*, but still another term. *Celtæ* was the *Greek* name. The *Latin* name was *Galli*.

To what population and what area did the Greek term apply? This is a point which requires close consideration. The Kelts of Herodotus belonged to the Spanish Peninsula. This is not the current doctrine. It is the inference, however, from the text.

"The river Ister runs through the whole of Europe, beginning with the Kelts and at the city of Pyrene." Without going into the details of this passage, we may safely say that it points to Spain.

"The Kelts, next to (μετὰ) the Kynetæ, are the most western population of Europe."—"The Kelts are frontagers to the Kynetæ, who are the most western population of Europe." This does the same.

"The Kelts are beyond the Pillars of Hercules." Considering the great extent to which maritime enterprise preceded overland explorations, we may reasonably suppose that a coasting voyage is implied in the words "beyond the Pillars of

5

Hercules." If so, we must look for the Kelts of Herodotus somewhere on the sea-coast to the west of the Straits of Gibraltar. Whether they are to be sought in the *extreme* west of Spain or Portugal is uncertain ; since it is uncertain who the Kynetæ were. They may have been occupants of the continent, as the word " frontager to the Kynetæ" (ὁμορόουσι) imply. But they may also have been Irish islanders—these being, truly and actually, the most western population of Europe. Or the geography may, altogether, be too loose to justify us in such *minutiæ* as the exact relations between the Kelts and Kynetæ imply.

Be this as it may, the most western area beyond the Pillars of Hercules, which is not also the extreme western part of Europe, is the district between the rivers Guadalquivir and Guadiana, or the western portion of Andalusia. Let us say that it is Seville and part of Algarve ; and then ask how far this position coincides with the accounts of the later geographers.

It coincides most closely. Strabo especially states that the chief population of the Anas (Guadiana) is that of the Keltæ (lib. iii. p. 139) : " the Anas bends towards the south, defining the Mesopotamia, of which the Keltæ are the chief occupants."

Of the other Kelts in Spain and Portugal further notice will be taken hereafter. The present remarks merely apply to the origin of the name. It seems in Herodotus to mean the Kelts of Strabo, *i.e.* the Kelts of Spain rather than the Kelts of Gaul.

From what language did it reach the informants of Herodotus ? From one of three.

a. It may have been Keltic, *i.e.* have been taken from the language of the population to which it applied, just as the word *English* is taken from the language of *England*.

b. Or it may have been Phenician, *i.e.* taken from the language of the Phenician traders with Spain, just as the word *British* is taken from the language of any of the commercial nations who talk of *British* rather than of *English* goods.

c. Or it may have been the language of the neighbouring tribes ; just as *Saxon* is the *Welsh* name of an Englishman.

I think that, in the first instance, at least, it was in the latter predicament. If so, who were their neighbours ? The Iberians of the eastern part of Spain.

The evidence, then, as far as it goes, is in favour of deducing the word *Kelt* from the Iberic.

The further we go the more we shall find confirmations of this view. There are *Kelts* in the *north*-west as well as in the *south*-west of Spain; about what is called, by Pliny, the Celtic Promontory. Who are the frontagers here? The Iberians of Leon and Asturias, even as the Iberians of Grenada and Cordova were the frontagers of the Keltæ of Seville.

There are Kelt-Iberians in the interjacent districts.

Wherever, then, there is a Spanish Kelt, there is, by his side, a Spanish Iberian to call him *Keltic*. Add to which, that it is the Iberian that lies between him and the classical countries of Rome and Greece; so that it is from the Iberian that the Greeks and Latins get their names for the populations further west; just as it is from England that the Europeans of the continent get the names for Wales and the several parts of Wales.

Again, the name Kelt is *general*. Has it not been applied to three populations? Now, in the earlier periods of their history, nations rarely apply general names to *themselves*. They usually know themselves as so many particular tribes. It is their neighbours who apply to them collective designations.

So much, then, in favor of the name Kelt being Iberic in origin. It may have been the name of *some* of the Kelts; but it was the Iberians who gave it its general import, just as it was the Romans who got the Hellenes called *Greeks*.

It may, also, have been taken by the Greeks from the Phenicians, rather than from the Iberians direct. Nevertheless, it was from the Iberians that it previously originated.

Can we speculate on its meaning? It looks, at present, as if it meant *western*. It scarcely, however, means this, as we shall soon see.

The Iberians extend along the coast of the Mediterranean (their inland extension need not now be investigated) into France, where, in the parts about the mouth of the Rhone, they come in contact with the Ligurians. The exact details of their frontier are unimportant. Strabo writes that all the parts beyond (*i.e.* west of) the Rhone, were called Iberia. Scylax writes that on the west of the same river, the Ligyes and Iberes were intermixed ($\mu i\gamma a\delta\epsilon\varsigma$).

Of course these Iberians extended to some distance inland, and where their area ended, that of the Gauls began. Now these Gauls are known to the Greeks as *Kelts*, being, at the same

time, the Gauls in the closest geographical contact with the Iberians—those Iberians lying between them and the sea.

Such is the history of the word during the time that it retains its original and special sense; during the time that it applies to certain populations of the Spanish Peninsula, and some of the Gauls. So long as it does this, it applies to a population conterminous with the Iberians.

It is Iberic, then, in its relation to the informants of Herodotus, and Iberic in respect to its general application. Yet it need not be Iberic in origin. ·The word *Greek* is, to *us*, a Latin word; yet it is no Latin word in its origin. It is the name of a particular population opposite Italy, and, as such, prominent in the eyes of Italians; so prominent as to supply an Italian name, destined to be diffused over the world, to the Hellenes of Athens, Chios, and elsewhere. ' Yet the word is only Latin to a certain extent—to the extent that the Latin language generalised and promulgated it.

The same may be the case with the word before us. *One* of the several frontagers of the Iberians may have called itself Kelt, even as one single population of Hellas called itself Greek, and this one may have supplied a name applicable to all the others.

Was this actually the case? We have seen how far the word is Iberic: let us now ask how far it is Keltic. Cæsar wrote that the tribes who were separated by the Garonne from the (Iberian) Aquitani were called in Latin *Galli*, in their own language *Celtæ*.

Some Kelts, then, designated themselves thus.

From these the Iberians, and, perhaps, also the Greeks of Marseilles, and the Phenicians, took the name, and gave it a general application—general enough to apply to certain occupants of the Spanish peninsula in the time of Herodotus, for this amount of generality it must have had.

That it was a geographical term, and used in anything like a technical or scientific sense so early, is improbable.

That it was a general name used by the Kelts themselves, wherever they were, is also unlikely. The Belgians and Britons show no trace of its use.

I submit, then, that the Keltic tribes of Spain were called Kelts because the Iberians, who knew them to belong to a different stock to themselves, and to the same as their frontagers in Gaul,

so called them, and that they so called them because certain Galli with whom they came in contact called themselves so.

This is, there or thereabouts, the history of the word *Greek*. A single tribe applied it to itself. The Romans promulgated it.

This, too, is the general history of collective names Populations know themselves only in their details. It is their *neighbours* who give them the names, which are, at once, distinctive and general.

On this principle it is probable that it was the Kelts who gave the Spaniards the name of Iberians—the Kelts, or, perhaps, the Phenicians. Certainly, not the Iberians themselves.

Is *Keltæ* the same word as *Galatæ?* The fact that the author of the treatise *De Mundo,* attributed to Aristotle, calls the Gulf of Lyons κόλπος Γαλάπκος, is evidence in favor of its being so. And such is the current opinion.

Is *Galat-æ* the same word as *Gall-i.* The fact of the Keltic plurals being formed by the addition of *-at* is evidence, etc.

If so, the roots of the two forms are *Gal-* and *Kel-,* the *-t* being inflexional. This, also, is the usual doctrine.

If so, the promulgators of the word—Iberian, Greek, or Phenician—took the word in its inflected rather than its radical state.

SECTION II.

DID ANY POPULATION OTHER THAN KELTIC BEAR THAT NAME, OR ONE LIKE IT?

A QUESTION of great practical importance must now be asked. Were there any populations other than those belonging to the class before us, designated by the name of Kelt? Or were there any called Galli, or Galatæ? Or were there any bearing the name of some Keltic tribe? If there were, it is obvious that false inferences may be drawn; inasmuch as populations connected by name only may pass for being more nearly allied than they really are.

This is a question that should *always* be asked in ethnology—not now and then, but invariably. It is a matter of fact (the explanation of which is foreign to the present notice) that with a very large proportion of ethnological names the phenomenon of repetition independent of connexion appears.

Take, for instance, the name *Cambrian*, or *Kymry*.   It is certainly so like the name *Cimmerian*, that, if it were not for the vast geographical interval, the two populations who bear it would be connected.   Indeed, by some writers, they *are* connected.   So that the instance in question may be said to prove too much.   But they are *Cumbrie* in Africa.   Will any one connect these with either Cambrians or Cimmerians, except in respect to the sound of their names?

Take, for instance, *German*.   There is a population so called in Spain, and a population with a name nearly identical in more than one part of Asia—*Carman*-ia, *Caraman*-ia, etc.

Take *Prussia*.   Word for word this is as like *Frisia* (*Friesland*) as *Fars* is like *Persia*—a word with which it is identical. Does any one, however, connect *Fries*-land and *Pruss*-ia?   We do not *now*, inasmuch as we know that they differ.   But what should we do if we knew nothing but the names?   Probably identify them.

What, then, if there be populations as little Keltic as the *Caramani*-ans are *Germ*-an, or as the *Cumbrie* are *Cymry*, or as the *Prussi*-ans are *Frisi*-an or *Pers*-ian, but which, nevertheless, bear names as like the form *Kelt*, etc., as these are to their fellows? We must look closely at them before we draw our inferences. But what if ancient writers have identified them with the true Kelts?   In that case we must look closer still.

In few fields of research is this general caution more necessary than in the one before us.   The Kelts, certainly, seem to be more than ordinarily ubiquitous.   Let us ask whether something of the kind in question may not be the reason for it.

I. *Dextro Suevici maris litore Æstiorum gentes alluuntur : quibus ritus habitusque Suevorum,* lingua Britannicæ propior. *Matrem deûm venerantur : insigne superstitionis, formas aprorum gestant.   Id pro armis omnique tutelâ : securum deæ cultorem etiam inter hostes præstat.   Rarus ferri, frequens fustium usus.   Frumenta ceterosque fructus patientiùs, quàm pro solitâ Germanorum inertiâ, laborant.   Sed et mare scrutantur ; ac soli omnium succinum, quod ipsi glesum vocant, inter vada atque in ipso litore legunt. Nec, quæ natura, quæve ratio gignat, ut barbaris, quæsitum compertumve.   Diu quinetiam inter cetera ejectamenta maris jacebat, donec luxuria nostra dedit nomen : ipsis in nullo usu ; rude legitur, informe perfertur, pretiumque mirantes accipiunt.   Succum tamen arborum esse intelligas, quia terrena quædam atque etiam volucria*

*animalia plerumque interlucent, quæ implicata humore, mox dur-
escente materiá, cluduntur. Fecundiora igitur nemora lucosque,
sicut Orientis secretis, ubi thura balsamaque sudantur, ita Occi-
dentis insulis terrisque inesse crediderim, quæ vicini solis radiis
expressa atque liquentia in proximum mare labuntur, ac vi tempes-
tatum in adversa litora exundant. Si naturam succini admoto igne
tentes, in modum tedæ accenditur, alitque flammam pinguem et
olentem ; mox ut in picem resinamve lentescit. (Taciti Germ., § 45.)*

What do we infer from this? *Some* have inferred that the
language of the amber-gatherers of East Prussia was actually a
Keltic form of speech. But what if *Britannica* mean *Prussian?*
Let us see whether it may not do so. The forms of the tenth
and eleventh centuries are Pruzzi, Pru*c*i, and Pru*t*zci, showing
that the sound was that of *ts*, or *tsh*, or, possibly, even *shtsh*
rather than of a simple *-s ;* a matter of some importance, as it
helps to account for the *t* required to make the root *Pruss-* like
the root *Brit-*.

Next comes the fact that we find the word taking an adjec-
tival form in *-en*, in which case the *s* becomes *th*. The substan-
tival forms are *Pruzzi, Prussi, Pruscia, Pruschia, Prutzci,
Prussia ;* but the adjectival ones are *Prutheni, Pruthenia, Pru-
thenicus.* We are now getting near the form *Britannicus ;* and
it must be remembered that the form thus similar, is the form
almost always used when the language is spoken of—Lingua
Pruthenica, not *Prussa*.

The root *Russ* undergoes a similar series of transformation—
Russi, Russia, Ruthenicus, Ruthenia.

All this, however, it may be said, applies to the Latin lan-
guage, and is, consequently, out of place ; the question being
whether *Slavonian* forms of the root *Prus-* can become sufficiently
like an equivalent modification of the root *Brit-* to create con-
fusion. They can. The Slavonic word which a German would
translate by *Brittisc*, and a Roman by *Britannica*, would be
Brit-*skaja*, and the similar equivalent to *Pruttisc* and *Pruthenica*,
Prut-*skaja*.

How like, and how different, the two adjectives may be, is
shown in the following columns :—

English . .	*British* . .	*Prussian.*
Latin . . .	*Britannica* .	*Pruthenica.*
Anglo-Saxon .	*Bryttisce* . .	*Pryttisce.*
Slavonic . .	*Britskaja* . .	*Prutskaja.*

But the B has to be accounted for. Why did not Tacitus write *Pritannicæ* if his informants spoke about Pruthenians? This is answered by the following extract, which shows that a *Brut* in Prussia (Pruthenia), as in Britain (Britannia), was the eponymus of the nation—"*Duces fuere duo, nempe* Bruteno *et Wudawutto, quorum alterum scilicet* Bruteno *sacerdotem crearunt, alterum scilicet Wudawutto in regem elegerunt . . Rex Wudawutto duodecim liberos masculos habebat, quorum nomina fuerunt* Litpho, Saimo, Sudo, Naidro, Scalawo, Natango, Bartho, Galindo, Warmo, Hoggo, Pomeszo, Chelmo . . . Warmo *nonus filius Wudawutti, a quo Warmia dicta, reliquit uxorem* Arma, *unde Ermelandt.*"

II. *Nec minùs valent retro Marsigni, Gothini, Osi, Burii: terga Marcomannorum, Quadorumque claudunt: e quibus Marsigni, et Burii sermone cultuque Suevos referunt.* Gothinos Gallica, *Osos Pannonica* lingua coarguit, non esse Germanos; *et quòd tributa patiuntur: partem tributorum Sarmatæ, partem Quadi, ut alienigenis, imponunt: Gothini, quò magis pudeat, et ferrum effodiunt: omnesque hi populi pauca campestrium, ceterùm saltus et vertices montium jugumque insederunt.* (*Tacit. Germ.,* § 43.)

What do we infer from this? *Many* have inferred that the language is Gallic, after the fashion of the language of Gaul. I do not, at present, say that it is not so. I only require reasons for making the undoubtedly Slavonic name of Halicz, or Gallicia, the probable locality for the *Gallica Lingua* of the Gothini other than Slavonic in origin. If these cannot be given, we must recognize the likelihood of there being Slavonic Galatæ, as well as Keltic.

The application of this will appear more than once (indeed it will appear prominently) in the sequel.

SECTION III.

EASTERN ORIGIN OF THE KELTS — HOW FAR REAL — HOW FAR NECESSARY TO THE MAIN QUESTION OF THE PRESENT TREATISE.

THE Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations is the title of the work before us. It is one, however, which requires a preliminary notice. In one sense, and with one school of ethnologists, the statement that the Kelts are of Eastern origin is little more than a truism.

Out of the vast proportion of investigators who assign to the whole of the human race one common origin, there are few who place the area of that common origin, either in Europe or America, still less in Australia or Polynesia. Add to this that *very* few indeed have ever put in a claim for Africa being the birthplace of mankind.

Such being the case, it is clear that, in the minds of many, *all* nations whatever are of Eastern origin—the Tasmanians, Polynesians, and Laplanders, as well as the Kelts; the Kelts as well as the Laplanders, Polynesians, or Tasmanians.

An Eastern origin of this kind, indirect and remote, is not the kind of Eastern origin upon which great ethnologists connect the history of any particular population. An Eastern origin of this kind is general, not to say universal; and its discussion forms part of general rather than special ethnology.

Neither is the Eastern origin of the present treatise an origin belonging to the historic period. It is not one like the Eastern (or British origin) of the present Americans. It is more general, indirect, and remote than this.

In arguing that the Kelts were of Eastern origin, Dr. Prichard meant this—viz. that they were in the same predicament with certain other nations, to whom, by universal consent (or nearly so), an Eastern origin was attributed; these nations being those belonging to the Gothic (or German), the Slavonic, the Lithuanic, the Greek, the Latin, and Sanskrit groups. That these formed a class was certain. It was as certain, too, as all but universal consent could make it, that they formed a class of Eastern origin. But it was not certain that to this class the Kelts belonged. Whether they did so or not, Dr. Prichard inquired; and, after inquiry, decided the question in the affirmative.

According to the views then and now generally entertained, this was to bring the Kelts from Asia, as well as to enlarge the previously constituted class; a class originally called Indo-*Germanic*, because its most Eastern member, represented by the Sanskrit, or ancient literary language of India, was on the Indus, and its most western on the Rhine. On these grounds, the name, though awkwardly compounded, was admitted. The admission, however, of the Kelts, effected a change. Instead of Indo-*Germanic*, Indo-*European* became the word, and so it remains to this day.

It is clear that, in the question under notice, there are two

elements.   Put in the form of syllogism, the reasoning runs
thus :—

All the Indo-European languages are of Eastern origin;
The Keltic languages are Indo-European ;
therefore
The Keltic languages are of Eastern origin.

Of these two premisses, it is the first that gives the title to the
work before us; the second which constitutes its contents.

Now there is something inconvenient in this; something
inconvenient, because it is not the Eastern origin for which Dr.
Prichard is more especially responsible.   Current opinion and
common consent are responsible for this.   Dr. Prichard's great
service to philology and ethnography consists in his showing
that the Keltic languages are Indo-European.

As long as the two statements are, for all practical purposes,
identical, the title-page is unexceptionable.   But what if the
major premiss be denied ? what if the Eastern origin of the Indo-
European populations be doubted ?   In such a case there is a
kind of antagonism between the name of the work before us,
and its contents.

Whether this be the case or not, will be seen in the
sequel.

Meanwhile, it will be advisable to consider the facts implied
by the title-page as accidental to the main subject, from which
(if need be) they may be separated without materially touching
the validity of proofs brought to bear upon it.   The Kelts may
have originated in Wales or Ireland, and yet, in their relations
to the other populations of Europe, be all that the forthcoming
dissertation makes them.

Such is the Eastern origin connected with the term Indo-
European.

But it is not the only one.

Long before the first investigator of the ancient language of
India had discovered that it contained European elements, long
before either the terms Indo-European or Indo-Germanic had come
into existence, or even embryo, there were writers who talked
and wrote about the Eastern origin of either all the Kelts or of
some of them.   Generally, however, it was only of some of
them. Of the Asiatic extraction of the Welsh, Cornishmen,
and Britons, little was said, and that little applied to their
ultimate and remote origin, rather than to any special migration

from Asia to Europe. With the Irish, however, it was far
different. Writer upon writer asserted for them an origin from
Ægypt, Persia, Palestine, or Phenicia—especially from Phenicia.
That this view differed, *toto cælo*, from the present doctrine, is
clear. The Phenicians were what the Hebrews were, and the
Hebrews were what is called Semitic; the Semitic class of lan-
guages being contrasted with the Indo-European, rather than
compared with.

The minute details of the history of opinion on this matter
I am unable to give. I think that, in the first instance, the
extent to which the Hebrew language, on the one side, and the
Keltic tongues, on the other, practised the initial permutation of
letters in their grammatical formations, may have had something
to do with suggesting the comparison. Then there were certain
habits and superstitions amongst the Kelts which put the com-
parative mythologist in mind of certain things Semitic; *e.g.* the
Bel-tane, or midsummer-day fire of the Highlands of Scotland,
incontinently got compared with fire-worship of the Phenician
Baal. Then there were the words *Bearla Fene*, or *Language of
Fene* (whatever that might be), of the Irish annals; a term which
was supposed to be well translated by *Lingua Pæna*, or *Lingua
Punica* — the language of Phenicia, or the Phenician colony of
Carthage.

Then there was the *mileadh = soldier*. Out of this, according
to Dr. Meyer, arose the doctrine that certain of the oldest Irish
families came from Miletus; whence the current term *Milesian*,
as applied to the most aristocratic portions of the Irish aristocracy.

When this doctrine had taken firm root, it ran out luxuriantly
into wide branches, loose foliage, and but little sound or ripe
fruit. The archæologists connected the Round Towers with
Asia and the worship of Baal.

Lastly came the comments upon the Carthaginian text in the
Pænulus of Plautus. Were not these Punic? and was not
Punic the Bearla Fene? Aylett Sammes, was (I believe) the
first who suggested that, even at the present time, a meaning
could be found for it in the modern Irish, and a meaning, accord-
ingly, *was* found. Whether this was the meaning of the
Dramatis Personæ of Plautus was another matter. It was not
the meaning that Bochart and others found for it in the true and
undoubted Hebrew. Neither were the words divided in the same
way. Neither was the absolute text of the MS. rigidly adhered

to. In short a good deal of license was allowed, and the result was as follows :—

Emendated and interpreted by Bochart, the ten first lines of a speech in Act v. s. 1, stand thus :—

1. N'yth alonim valonuth sicorath jismacon sith
2. Chy-mlachai jythmu mitslia mittebariim ischi
3. Liphorcaneth yth beni ith jad adi ubinuthai
4. Birua rob syllohom alonim ubymisyrtohom
5. Bythtym moth ymoth othi helech Antidamarchon
6. Ys sideli : brym tyfel yth chili schontem liphul
7. Uth bin imys dibur thim nocuth nu' Agorastocles
8. Ythem aneti hy chyr saely choc, sith naso.
9. Binni id chi lu hilli gubylim lasibil thym
10. Body aly thera ynn' yss' immoncon lu sim—

The same, in Hebrew characters.

‎1. נא את עליונים ועליונות שכורת יסמכון זאת :
‎2. כי מלכי נתמו : מצליח מדבריהם עסקי :
‎3. לפורקנת את בני את יר ערי ובנותי :
‎4. בריח רב שלהם עליונים ובמשורתהם :
‎5. בטרם מות חנות אותי הלך אנתידתמרכון :
‎6. איש שירעלי : ברם טפל את חילי שכינתם לאפל :
‎7. את בן אמיץ דבור תם נקוט נוה אנורסטוקלים :
‎8. חותם חנותי הוא כיור שאלי חוק זאת נושא :
‎9. ביני עד כי לו האלה גבולים לשבת תם :
‎10. בוארי עלי תרע אנא : הנו אשאל אם מנכר לו שם :

Six lines following these were determined to be *Liby*-Phœnician, or the language of the native Africans in the neighbourhood of Carthage, mixed with Punic. These, it was stated, had the same meaning with the ten lines in Carthaginian.

The following lines of Plautus have, by all commentators, been viewed in the same light; viz. as the Latin version of the speech of the Carthaginian.

1. Deos Deasque veneror, qui hanc urbem colunt,
2. Ut, quod de mea re huc veni, rite venerim.
3. Measque hic ut gnatas, et mei fratris filium
4. Reperire me siritis : Di vostram fidem !
5. Quæ mihi surruptæ sunt, et fratris filium :
6. Sed hic mihi antehac hospes Antidamas fuit.
7. Eum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciendum fuit.
8. Ejus filium hic esse prædicant Agorastoclem :
9. Deum hospitalem et tesseram mecum fero :
10. In hisce habitare monstratum est regionibus.
11. Hos percunctabor, qui huc egrediuntur foras.

Guided by the metrical *paraphrase* of the original author, Bochart laid before the scholars of his time a Latin version, of which the following is an English translation.

Close Translation of Bochart's Latin Version.

1. I ask the Gods and Goddesses that preside over this city,
2. That my plans may be fulfilled.—May my business prosper under their guidance !
3. The release of my son and my daughters from the hands of a robber.
4. May the Gods grant this, through the mighty spirit that is in them, and by their providence !
5. Before his death, Antidamarchus used to sojourn with me,
6. A man intimate with me : but he has joined the ranks of those whose dwelling is in darkness (the dead).
7. There is a general report that his son has here taken his abode ; viz. Agorastocles.
8. The token (tally) of my claim to hospitality is a carven tablet, the sculpture whereof is my God. This I carry.
9. A witness has informed me that he lives in this neighbourhood.
10. Somebody comes this way through the gate : Behold him : I'll ask him whether he knows the name.

With this compare or contrast—

The Gaelic Version.

1. N'iaith all o nimh uath lonnaithe socruidshe me comsith
2. Chimi lach chuinigh ! muini is toil, miocht beiridh iar mo seith
3. Liomhtha can ati bi mitche ad éadan beannaithe
4. Bior nar ob siladh umhal : o nimh ! ibhim a frotha !
5. Beith liom ! mo thime noctaithe ; neil ach tan ti daisic mac coinme
6. Is i de leabhraim tafach leith, chi lis con teampluibh ulla
7. Uch bin nim i is de beart inn a ccomhnuithe Agorastocles !
8. Itche mana ith a chithirsi ; leiceeath sith nosa !
9. Buaine na iad cheile ile : gabh liom an la so bithim' !
10. Bo dileachtach nionath n' isle, mon cothoil us im.

In English.

1. Omnipotent much-dreaded Deity of this country ! assuage my troubled mind !
2. Thou ! the support of feeble captives ! being now exhausted with fatigue, of thy free will be guide to my children !
3. O let my prayers be perfectly acceptable in thy sight !
4. An inexhaustible fountain to the humble ; O Deity ! let me drink of its streams !
5. Forsake me not ! my earnest desire is now disclosed, which is only that of recovering my daughters.
6. This was my fervent prayer, lamenting their misfortunes in thy sacre temples.
7. O bounteous Deity ! it is reported here dwelleth Agorastocles.
8. Should my request appear just, let here my disquietudes cease.

9. Let them be no longer concealed; O that I may this day find my
   daughters?
10. They will be fatherless, and preys to the worst of men, unless it be thy
    pleasure that I should find them.

It was clear that from all these Hebrew affinities on the part
of the existing Irish, one of two things must result—either the
other Keltic tongues, such as the Welsh and Breton, must be
Semitic, or the Irish must be separated from them. I know of
no work of greater importance than one of Sir William Betham's,
wherein this alternative is thoroughly and fully acted on. In
this, however (the Gael and Kymry), he expressly and clearly sees
likenesses between the Irish and the Hebrew where he as ex-
pressly and clearly does *not* see much closer ones between the
Irish and the Welsh. This is the way in which ingenious hypo-
theses break down. The unreal coincidences are, for a while,
magnified. The real ones, however, come into the field of vision
and eclipse them, save and except in the case of those eyes that,
afflicted with etymological *nyctalopia,* see better in the dark than
in daylight.

SECTION IV.

CÆSAR'S NOTICE OF THE GAULS.

It is in the sixth book of the *Bellum Gallicum* that we find
Cæsar's account of the Gauls; the basis of nine-tenths of our
speculation concerning their manners and religion. I give it *in
extenso.*

The extent to which Gallia is contrasted with Germania,
should be noticed. Of the latter country Cæsar's knowledge
was limited. The days when inroads were made deep into the
soil of Germany had yet to come. The arms of Drusus and
Germanicus had yet to be carried northwards. Cæsar, himself,
knew best the army of Ariovistus, and, next to it, the Usipetes
and Tenchteri of the parts about Cologne. He had crossed the
Rhine, but that was all. No mention in his pages occurs of the
Sigambri, who, in the reign of Augustus, are often mentioned.
Hence we must look upon his knowledge of Germany as imper-
fect; some portions of which he procured from Gauls; some
from officers of his own, especially C. Valerius Procillus, who is

stated to have conversed with Ariovistus; and some from books, for it must be remarked that he refers to Eratosthenes for the dimensions of the great Hercynian forest. And—

Lastly, it must be remarked that it is the Gauls who use the words *Germani* and *Germania*. The Germans *may* have called themselves so. We have no proof, however, that they did. All we *know* of the word is that it was Gallic. It may or may not have been German as well. The editor thinks that it was not.

* * * * *

Quoniam ad hunc locum perventum est, non alienum esse videtur, de Galliæ Germaniæque moribus, et quo differant hæ nationes inter sese, proponere. In Gallia non solum in omnibus civitatibus atque in omnibus pagis partibusque, sed pæne etiam in singulis domibus factiones sunt: earumque factionum principes sunt, qui summam auctoritatem eorum judicio habere existimantur, quorum ad arbitrium judiciumque summa omnium rerum consiliorumque redeat. Idque ejus rei caussa antiquitus institutum videtur, ne quis ex plebe contra potentiorem auxilii egeret: suos enim quisque opprimi et circumveniri non patitur, neque, aliter si faciant, ullam inter suos habent auctoritatem. Hæc eadem ratio est in summa totius Galliæ: namque omnes civitates in partes divisæ sunt duas.

Quum Cæsar in Galliam venit, alterius factionis principes erant Ædui, alterius Sequani. Hi quum per se minus valerent, quod summa auctoritas antiquitus erat in Æduis, magnæque eorum erant clientelæ, Germanos atque Ariovistum sibi adjunxerant eosque ad se magnis jacturis pollicitationibusque perduxerant. Prœliis vero compluribus factis secundis, atque omni nobilitate Æduorum interfecta, tantum potentia antecesserant, ut magnam partem clientium ab Æduis ad se transducerent obsidesque ab iis principum filios acciperent et publice jurare cogerent, nihil se contra Sequanos consilii inituros; et partem finitimi agri, per vim occupatam, possiderent Galliæque totius principatum obtinerent.

* * * * *

In omni Gallia eorum hominum, qui aliquo sunt numero atque honore, genera sunt duo: nam plebes pæne servorum habetur loco, quæ per se nihil audet et nullo adhibetur consilio. Plerique, quum aut ære alieno, aut magnitudine tributorum, aut injuria potentiorum prementur, sese in servitutem dicant nobili-

bus, in hos eadem omnia sunt jura, quæ dominis in servos. Sed de his duobus generibus alterum est Druidum, alterum Equitum. Illi rebus divinis intersunt, sacrificia publica ac privata procurant, religiones interpretantur. Ad hos magnus adolescentium numerus disciplinæ caussa concurrit, magnoque ii sunt apud eos honore. Nam fere de omnibus controversiis publicis privatisque consti-tuunt; et, si quod est admissum facinus, si cædes facta, si de hæreditate, si de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt; præmia pœnasque constituunt: si qui aut privatus aut publicus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna apud eos est gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur; iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi acci-piant: neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur. His autem omnibus Druidibus præest unus, qui summam inter eos habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo, si qui ex reliquis excellit dignitate succedit: at, si sunt plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur, nonnumquam etiam armis de principatu contendunt. Hi certo anni tempore in finibus Car-nutum, quæ regio totius Galliæ media habetur, considunt in loco consecrato. Huc omnes undique, qui controversias habent, conveniunt eorumque decretis judiciisque parent. Disciplina in Britannia reperta atque inde in Galliam translata esse existi-matur: et nunc, qui diligentius eam rem cognoscere volunt, plerumque illo discendi caussa proficiscuntur.

Druides a bello abesse consuerunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt; militiæ vacationem omniumque rerum habeat immunitatem. Tantis excitati præmiis, et sua sponte multi in disciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquisque mittuntur. Magnum ibi numerum versuum ediscere dicuntur: itaque annos nonnulli vicenos in disciplina permanent. Neque fas esse existimant, ea litteris mandare, quum in reliquis fere rebus, publicis privatisque rationibus, Græcis utantur litteris. Id mihi duabus de caussis instituisse videntur; quod neque in vulgum disciplinam efferri velint, neque eos, qui discant, litteris confisos, minus memoriæ studere; quod fere plerisque accidit, ut præsidio, litterarum diligentiam in perdiscendo ac memoriam remittant. In primis hoc volunt persuadere, non interire animas, sed ab aliis post mortem transire ad alios: atque hoc maxime ad virtutem excitari putant, metu mortis neglecto. Multa præterea de sideribus atque eorum motu, de mundi ac terrarum magnitudine,

de rerum natura, de deorum immortalium vi ac potestate disputant et juventuti transdant.

Alterum genus est equitum. Hi, quum est usus, atque aliquod bellum incidit (quod ante Cæsaris adventum fere quotannis accidere solebat, uti aut ipsi injurias inferrent, aut illatas propulsarent), omnes in bello versantur: atque eorum ut quisque est genere copiisque amplissimus, ita plurimos circum se ambactos clientesque habent. Hanc unam gratiam potentiamque noverunt.

Natio est omnis Gallorum admodum dedita religionibus: atque ob eam caussam, qui sunt adfecti gravioribus morbis, quique in prœliis periculisque versantur, aut pro victimis homines immolant, aut se immolaturos vovent administrisque ad ea sacrificia Druidibus utuntur; quod, pro vita hominis nisi hominis vita reddatur, non posse aliter deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur: publiceque ejusdem generis habent instituta sacrificia. Alii immani magnitudine simulacra habent, quorum contexta viminibus membra vivis hominibus complent, quibus succensis, circumventi flamma exanimantur homines. Supplicia eorum, qui in furto, aut in latrocinio, aut aliqua noxa sint comprehensi, gratiora diis immortalibus esse arbitrantur; sed, quum ejus generis copia deficit, etiam ad innocentium supplicia descendunt.

Deum maxime Mercurium colunt: hujus sunt plurima simulacra, hunc omnium inventorem artium ferunt, hunc viarum atque itinerum ducem, hunc ad quæstus pecuniæ mercaturasque habere vim maximam arbitrantur. Post hunc, Apollinem et Martem et Jovem et Minervam: de his eamdem fere, quam reliquæ gentes, habent opinionem; Apollinem morbos depellere, Minervam operum atque artificiorum initia transdere; Jovem imperium cœlestium tenere; Martem bella regere. Huic, quum prœlio dimicare constituerunt, ea, quæ bello ceperint, plerumque devovent. Quæ superaverint, animalia capta immolant; reliquas res in unum locum conferunt. Multis in civitatibus harum rerum exstructos tumulos locis consecratis conspicari licet: neque sæpe accidit, ut, neglecta quispiam religione, aut capta apud se occultare, aut posita tollere auderet; gravissimumque ei rei supplicium cum cruciatu constitutum est.

Galli se omnes ab Dite patre prognatos prædicant, idque ab Druidibus proditum dicunt. Ob eam caussam spatia omnis temporis non numero dierum, sed noctium finiunt; dies natales

et mensium et annorum initia sic observant, ut noctem dies subsequatur. In reliquis vitæ institutis hoc fere ab reliquis differunt, quod suos liberos, nisi quum adoleverint, ut munus militiæ sustinere possint, palam ad se adire non patiuntur, filiumque puerili ætate in publico, in conspectu patris, adsistere, turpe ducunt.

Viri, quantas pecunias ab uxoribus dotis nomine acceperunt, tantas ex suis bonis, æstimatione facta, cum dotibus communi-cant. Hujus omnis pecuniæ conjunctim ratio habetur, fruc-tusque servantur : uter eorum vita superarit, ad eum pars utriusque cum fructibus superiorum temporum pervenit. Viri in uxores, sicuti in liberos, vitæ necisque habent potestatem : et, quum pater familiæ, illustriore loco natus, decessit, ejus propinqui conveniunt et, de morte si res in suspicionem venit, de uxoribus in servilem modum quæstionem habent et, si compertum est, igni atque omnibus tormentis excrutiatas interficiunt. Funera sunt pro cultu Gallorum magnifica et sumptuosa; omniaque, quæ vivis cordi fuisse arbitrantur, in ignem inferunt, etiam animalia; ac paullo supra hanc memoriam servi et clientes, quos ab iis dilectos esse constabat, justis funeribus confectis, una cremabantur.

Quæ civitates commodius suam rem publicam administrare existimantur, habent legibus sanctum, si quis quid de re publica a finitimis rumore ac fama acceperit, uti ad magistratum deferat, neve cum quo alio communicet : quod sæpe homines temerarios atque imperitos falsis rumoribus terreri et ad facinus impelli et de summis rebus consilium capere cognitum est. Magistratus, quæ visa sunt, occultant ; quæque esse ex usu judicaverint, multitudini produnt. De re publica nisi per concilium loqui non conceditur.

Germani multum ab hac consuetudine differunt : nam neque Druides habent, qui rebus divinis præsint, neque sacrificiis student. Deorum numero eos solos ducunt, quos cernunt et quorum aperte opibus juvantur, Solem et Vulcanum et Lunam : reliquos ne fama quidem acceperunt. Vita omnis in venationibus atque in studiis rei militaris consistit : ab parvulis labori ac duritiæ student. Qui diutissime impuberes permanserunt, maximam inter suos ferunt laudem : hoc ali staturam, ali hoc vires nervosque confirmari putant. Intra annum vero vicesimum feminæ notitiam habuisse, in turpissimis habent rebus ; cujus rei nulla est occultatio, quod et promiscue in fluminibus perluuntur,

et pellibus aut parvis rhenonum tegimentis utuntur, magna corporis parte nuda.

Agriculturæ non student; majorque pars victus eorum in lacte, caseo, carne consistit : neque quisquam agri modum certum aut fines habet proprios : sed magistratus ac principes in annos singulos gentibus cognationibusque hominum, qui una coierint, quantum, et quo loco visum est, agri adtribuunt atque anno post alio transire cogunt. Ejus rei multas adferunt caussas; ne, adsidua consuetudine capti, studium belli gerundi agricultura commutent; ne latos fines parare studeant potentioresque humiliores possessionibus expellant; ne adcuratius ad frigora atque æstus vitandos ædificent; ne qua oriatur pecuniæ cupiditas, qua ex re factiones dissensionesque nascuntur; ut animi æquitate plebem contineant, quum suas quisque opes cum potentissimis æquari videat.

Civitatibus maxima laus est, quam latissimas circum se vastatis finibus solitudines habere. Hoc proprium virtutis existimant, expulsos agris finitimos cedere, neque quemquam prope audere consistere : simul hoc se fore tutiores arbitrantur, repentinæ incursionis timore sublato. Quum bellum civitas aut illatum defendit, aut infert : magistratus, qui ei bello præsint, ut vitæ necisque habeant potestatem, deliguntur. In pace nullus est communis magistratus, sed principes regionum atque pagorum inter suos jus dicunt, controversiasque minuunt. Latrocinia nullam habent infamiam, quæ extra fines cujusque civitatis fiunt; atque ea juventutis exercendæ ac desidiæ minuendæ caussa fieri prædicant. Atque, ubi quis ex principibus in concilio dixit, "se ducem fore; qui sequi velint, profiteantur," consurgunt ii, qui et caussam et hominem probant, suumque auxilium pollicentur atque ab multitudine collaudantur : qui ex iis secuti non sunt, in desertorum ac proditorum numero ducuntur omniumque iis rerum postea fides derogatur. Hospites violare, fas non putant; qui quaque de caussa ad eos venerint, ab injuria prohibent sanctosque habent; iis omnium domus patent, victusqne communicatur.

Ac fuit antea tempus, quum Germanos Galli virtute superarent, ultro bella inferrent, propter hominum multitudinem agrique inopiam trans Rhenum colonias mitterent. Itaque ea, quæ fertilissima sunt, Germaniæ loca circum Hercyniam silvam (quam Eratostheni et quibusdam Græcis fama notam esse video, quam illi Orcyniam adpellant), Volcæ Tectosages occupaverunt atque

ibi consederunt.   Quæ gens ad hoc tempus iis sedibus sese con-
tinet summamque habet justitiæ et bellicæ laudis opinionem :
nunc quoque in eadem inopia, egestate, patientia, qua Germani,
permanent eodem victu et cultu corporis utuntur ; Gallis autem
provinciæ propinquitas, et transmarinarum rerum notitia, multa
ad copiam atque usus largitur.   Paullatim adsuefacti superari,
multisque victi prœliis, ne se quidem ipsi cum illis virtute
comparant.

With Cæsar's text as a preliminary, we may proceed to the
investigation of the *ancient* Keltic area—real or supposed.

SECTION V.

The original Keltic area is one thing, the areas into which
the Kelts intruded is another.

Germany is the original English area.   England, and, still
more, America, are areas into which the English have intruded.

Let these two sorts of area be kept separate.

The limits of Keltic Gaul on the side of Spain will be con-
sidered in the sequel.   So will certain statements connected with
the Kelts of Dauphiny and Provence.   So will Belgium, and
Valley of the Rhine.

We begin the series of criticisms immediately before us with
Savoy.   Was this Keltic ?   There would be no reason to consider
it otherwise, were it not for a passage in Livy, who speaks of
(xxi., 38) the country about the Mons Peninus (a Keltic name,
Pen = Ben) as being *obsepta gentibus semi-Germanis—Veragri
incolæ jugi*.   Zeuss takes the passage as it stands, without taking
exceptions to it.   He admits that, in the time of Cæsar, the
evidence is in favour of the population being Gallic ; but the
Gauls he makes intrusive.   More than this, he sees in the name
Chabilci, a name which, in a passage of Avienus, occurs along
with *Tylangii, Daliterni*, and *Temenicus ager*, the same word as
the word Καουλκοι of Strabo.   He also sees ways in which
the others may take a meaning in German.

Cæsar, who, as an authority, is worth all the rest put
together, mentions the Veragri, the Seduni, and the Nantuates.
The first of these *may* be a Keltic name = *the men (fear, gwr)*

of Mons *Okria*. The third cannot well be other than Keltic; *nant = valley, nantuates = dalesmen*.

Which is the likelier, that Livy should have used the word *semi-Germanis* in a sense different to Zeuss' interpretation? or that the changes, etc., necessary to make a German occupancy of Savoy compatible with the other facts of the case should have occurred between the time of the Second Punic War and Cæsar's conquest? The further we proceed, the more we shall hesitate to make Livy's *Veragri*, etc., Germans. We shall find Kelts beyond their area, *i.e.* in—

Parts of Switzerland—Helvetia.—The modern Switzerland is partly the Helvetia, partly the Rhætia, of the ancients. Let us look to the Helvetic portion first. Cæsar treats all the Helvetii as Gauls; and I see no reason, either in the way of conflicting testimony, or internal evidence, to take exceptions to the doctrine indicated by his text. A point, however, connected with it deserves notice. It bears upon the ethnological origin of the English *hundred*. Was it Keltic or German? In one place Cæsar says that the *civitas* of the Helvetii had four hundred villages; in another, he says that it was divided into four *pagi*. Put these two statements together, and we get the English Hundred in Gallic Helvetia. Of two of these *pagi* he gives us the names — the *pagus Tigurinus*, and the *pagus Verbigenus*. Strabo makes the number of the tribes ($\phi\hat{v}\lambda a$) three, of which two (*the two* = $\tau\grave{a}$ $\delta\acute{v}o$) were destroyed. This would leave but one, probably that of the Helvetii proper. In this he seems to have taken the two names of Cæsar, and presumed that the Helvetii gave a third. This, however, is a detail of no importance in relation to the main question. So is a point which will be noticed in the sequel, viz. the Desert ($\ddot{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu o\varsigma$) of the Helvetii, and the Helvetian area in Wurtemburg.

SECTION VI.

THE KELTIC AREA—THE TYROL—RHÆTIA.

Helvetic Switzerland being Keltic, was *Rhætian* Switzerland the same?

Rhætia, besides a moiety of Switzerland, comprised the Tyrol.

The ethnology of Rhætia is the ethnology of a population of such interest and importance as to claim (if space permitted) a separate monograph. Neither would such a notice be a brief one; the population in question being the ancient Etruscans.

The opinions concerning their relations are well known to be numerous and antagonistic. The earlier doctrine was that they were the same as the Tyrseni of Herodotus; and these the historian deduces from Lydia. In this view there are two assumptions: first, that the Etruscans and Tyrseni were one and the same people; next, that the account of Herodotus was true. Niebuhr denied the first, and drew a distinction between them. He might have demurred to the second.

The views that (perhaps) are now prevalent are chiefly founded on an objection of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and a statement in Livy. The former remarks that Xanthus, the special historian of Lydia, makes no mention of the events related by Herodotus; and that Xanthus being a native investigator is important, in both what he says, and what he leaves unsaid.

Livy states that the Alpine nations, and especially the Rhæti, are of Tuscan origin; but that the mountaineers, having become barbarized by their mountain localities, have kept nothing Tuscan but the language, and that in a corrupted form. This passage, though well-known, has scarcely had the full value given it. It has scarcely been recognised as more than an ordinary piece of ancient ethnology—the general rule being that ancient ethnology is of a very indifferent quality. It is, however, something more than this. It is the statement of a cotemporary writer to a special and important fact; *i.e.* to the fact of the Tuscan language being spoken in the Rhætian Alps. It is this, and something more. The conditions of place were as favorable to Livy as those of time. He lived when the language was spoken, and, as a native of Padua, he lived in the neighbourhood of those who spoke it.

Whether he is equally to be relied upon in deducing the Rhæti from the Tuscans, rather than the Tuscans from the Rhæti (for so his statement runs, though it is by no means certain that it was meant to be interpreted very closely), is another question. *This* is not a point on which he is a witness; nor yet one upon which he was in condition that might make him one. It was an inference rather than an observation; and, as such, stands in a different category from his notice of their language.

Upon this latter we must argue.   To set it aside, or to post-
pone it to the account of Herodotus and his Lydians is to allow
legend, tradition, inference, or what not, to take precedence of
historical testimony.

It does not, however, follow that because the Rhætians were
Tuscan, all the other Alpine tribes were the same.   It does not
even follow that because some of the Rhætians were Tuscans
all were so.   This is what Zeuss maintains.   Certain small tribes,
such as the Stoni, Lepontii, and Tridentini, were remains of the
Etruscans.   But is it right to infer therefrom that *all* the Rhæti
were Etruscan?   The question must be determined by other
considerations.

Thus criticized, the statement of Livy, according to both
Zeuss and Dieffenbach, goes no further than to indicate the
existence of *some* Tuscans in Rhætia.   What were the other
tribes?   Both Zeuss and Dieffenbach make them Keltic.   There
is a certain amount of testimony to this effect: there are the
presumptions arising out of the geographical position of the Kelt
frontier, and there are certain geographical names which are
Keltic in form.   Is this sufficient?

Steub, in his Rhætian Ethnology (*Beiträge zur Rhätischen
Ethnologie*, 1854), thinks it is not.   The more definite Keltic
names, *Bragodurum, Ectodurum, Ebodurum*, and *Thrasomagus*, he
refers to either the parts beyond Rhætia Proper, or else to its
extreme frontier.   He also shows that the uniformity of nomencla-
ture over the whole area is incompatible with the doctrine that a
Keltic population was the chief population of the country.

In this he seems to argue rightly.   There are *some* traces of
a Keltic population; but they are insufficient to disturb the
inference drawn from the text of Livy and the internal evidence
of the local names.

There are *some* traces of a Keltic population; but this need
not even have been the occupants of any portion of the Rhætian
area.

There were Kelts on the Rhætian frontier, and the line of
that frontier was, probably, very irregular.

To disprove the Keltic hypothesis, is only one portion of
Steub's work.   He also undertakes the identification of the
Rhætian and Etruscan tongues.   This is difficult.   With only a
few intelligible words of the latter, and with the former repre-
sented by those scanty elements of the present Rumonsch, which

are neither of Latin nor German origin, all his acuteness was required. He has, therefore, done what was to be expected— forced some of his facts upon hard service. The sounds of *b*, *d*, *g*, and *o*, are believed to have been wanting in the Etruscan. The same sounds are said to be wanting in the Rumonsch. The most, I think, that can be said upon this point, is that they have a tendency to be replaced by *p*, *t*, *c*, and *a*.

Again, the personal names on the tombs of Etruria can be found in the Tyrol, but not as the names of men and women ; only as those of geographical localities. Hence the doctrine runs that the proper names of the necrology of Etruria are the proper names of Rhætian topography. There is a great deal of assumption here.

Again, the names, as they stand on the Etrurian sepulchres, are extremely consonantal, *e.g. Carthnal, Tarchna*, etc. This, however, is no part of the language. The fuller forms, without their orthographic abbreviations, are *Caratunala, Taracuna*, etc. The former of these he calls the epigraphic (*i.e.* inscriptional), the latter the Rhætian, forms—Rhætian meaning the Etruscan as it was spoken, or as it was in some older and more vocalic form.

With this postulate he gives the following table :—

RHÆTIAN.	EPIGRAPHIC.	OLD TYROL.*	MODERN TYROL.
Achunusa	Achunisa	*Aguns*	Agums.
Arathalusa	Arthalisa	———	Ortles.
Auluna	Aulinna	———	Aulinna.
Cafata	Cafate	———	Gfad.
Cafatala	Cafatial	*Caffeciol*	Tschafatsch.
Capuna	Capna	———	Tschafon.
Capatuna	Capatine	*Cuvedun*	Gufidaun.
Capatusa	Capatesa	———	Gebatsch.
Calusa	Calisa	———	Tschölis, Glis.
Calusuna	Calusna	*Cholsaun*	Galsaun.
Calutuva	Clutiva	———	Kaldiff.
Caruna	Carna	———	Garn, Graun.
Carunala	Carnal	———	Karnel, Karnol.
Caracuna	Carcuna	———	Tschirgant.
Caracusa	Carcusa	*Chorzes*	Kortsch.
Carutuna	Cartuna (St. N.)	*Cardun*	Kardaun.

* From documents.

RHÆTIAN.	EPIGRAPHIC.	OLD TYROL.	MODERN TYROL.
Carutusa	Ciarthisa	*Zardes*	Tschars.
Caratunala	Carthnal	————	Karthnal.
Caratalusa	Ciarthialisa	————	Gretles.
Laruna	Larna	————	Larein.
Marucanusa	Marcanisa	*Marzshenis*	Marschlins.
Maruna	Marina	————	Marein.
Matuluna	Methlna	*Maduleno*	Madulein.
Perusala	Perisal	————	Persall.
Perusalusa	Perisalisa	*Presels*	Presels.
Patusa	Patis	*Patse*	Patsch.
Rasuna	Rasna	————	Rasein.
Suthuruna	Suthrina	————	Sadrun.
Suthurusa	Suthrisa	————	Sauters.
Taluna	Thalna	————	Talluna.
Taracuna	Tarchna	————	Tertschein.
Taracusa	Tarchisa	*Tarcis*	Tartsch.
Thurunusa	Thrinisa	*Truns*	Trins.
Thurusa	Thauris	*Tieres*	Tiers.
Thurusuna	Tursna	————	Torsanna.
Thusuna	Thuseni	*Tusen*	Tisen.
Varuna	Varna	*Varna*	Varn.
Venalusa	Venalisa	*Venls*	Vendels.
Vulana	Velani	*Fulano*	Völlan.
Vularusa	Velarisa	*Volares*	Volders.
Vulusa	Velisa	*Velis*	Vels.
Vulasuna	Velsuna	————	Valsun.
Vuluta	Velta	————	Vilt.
Vulutuna	Velthuna	*Valduna*	Valduna.
Vulatura	Velthuria	————	Vuldera.
Vulaturunusa	Velthurnisa	*Velthurnes*	Velthurns.

It cannot be denied that there is much assumption here. Nevertheless, the doctrine that Rhætia was Tuscan, and Etruria Rhætian, is sound. The investigations of Steub prove that the language was one over the whole province; and the proper confirmation of them will appear when, after an elimination of the Latin and German elements of the Rumonsch language, and a similar ejection of the Latin from the Etrurian dialect of the Italian, the residue of the two shall be found to coincide.

As it is, however, the evidence to the fact of the Tuscan language having been spoken by the Rhæti, is historical, to say the

least of it; which is more than can be said of any contrary assertion.

But the Tuscans may have been Kelts. I do not say that the evidence of antiquity is quite conclusive against this view. I only say that I know of no author who has ever identified the two—the Tuscans of Etruria and the Gauls of the Cisalpines.

Were the Rhætian Tuscans of Livy foreign to the Alpine ocalities in which the author places them? This they may have been; in which case they must be looked upon as recent, intrusive, and exceptional populations. The Gauls, who took so many cities from the Tuscans of the valley of the Po, may have driven the remainder into the mountains. Common as is this method of accounting for the existence of an isolated population, it is hardly ever correct. Impracticable mountains are not the places of refuge to tribes who have been driven from the level country. They are rather the districts which the conquerors of the plain leave untouched; the population which they contain being, for the most part, aboriginal.

Upon the whole, I infer that Rhætia, originally other than Keltic, was not only in contact with the Keltic areas of Helvetia and Northern Italy, but was deeply indented by extensions of the Keltic frontier. It might have contained Keltic colonies—especially in the time of the Empire.

What the Rhæti, and what the Etrusci were, taken collectively, is another question.

SECTION VII.

STYRIA AND CARINTHIA—NORICUM.

Prichard, in making the occupants of the Western Alps Keltic, gives the following extract from Polybius—an excellent authority: On the "side which looks towards the north, and the river Rhone, dwelt those termed Transalpine Gauls, who are of the same origin with the rest, meaning the Cisalpine tribes, and are only so termed on account of their local situation. On the other side, he adds, are the Taurisci, the Agones (Lingones), and other nations." I submit that this suggests a difference between the populations of the western and eastern ranges, and

that it favours, rather than opposes, the view just exhibited respecting the Rhæti.

Nevertheless, the authors who call the population of Noricum *Kelts* and *Galatæ* are numerous and respectable, Strabo being one of them. The exception, however, that lies against the inference deducible from the use of these terms has been pointed out. And, in the present case, it is taken. The presumptions are against Noricum having been Keltic, inasmuch as Rhætia, on its Gallic side, was other than Gallic.

The evidence of the local names, which was anything but conclusive in respect to Rhætia, is still less conclusive here; indeed, undeniable forms like the compounds in *durum, magus,* etc., are wanting.

A name synonymous, or nearly so, with Norici, is *Taurisci.* Now the form in *-isc,* though Slavonic, German, and Latin (Vol*sci*), is, by no means, Keltic Zeuss, indeed, claims for it the Kelts (*note in voc.* NORICI), but only by arguing in a circle. The name Scord*isci* is from the mountain Scordus, and the Scord*isci* are Kelts. But this is just the point that requires better proof than it has met with.

Out of the six Noric populations of Ptolemy, three require notice, from the fact of their names beginning with the same element, viz. the *Amb*-isontii, the *Amb*-idravi, and the *Amb*-ilici. As the latter halves of these compounds are the names of the rivers *Isonzo, Drave,* and *Lech,* the import of the combination *amb-* is easily divined. It denotes the occupants of the water-systems in question. The particular way in which it does this is doubtful. It is, probably, a preposition, like *Cis-* and *Trans-,* in words like *Cis*-alpine and *Trans*-alpine, or like the Slavonic *Po-* in *Po*-merania = *on the sea.*

Granted this—to what language does it belong? Zeuss finds it in the Gallic, and holds that it is the *Amb-* in *Amb-actus,* and *Amb-arri*; the latter being supposed to = *Amb-arari* = *the occupants of the Arar.* It may, perhaps, be this; but it may easily be the Greek ἀμφι, which I think it is. Were the Norici, then, Greeks? By no means. Only the sources of Ptolemy's terminology were Greeks, who translated the Noric names, or, at any rate, put them into a Greek form. But is this likely? Look at the map of ancient Dacia, and see the number of words ending in *-ensii,* all of which are not only supposed, but generally admitted, to be the Latin forms in *-entes.*

Noricum leads us to Illyria, the Taurisci to the Scordisci. Now, just as good authors speak of the Kelts of Noricum, so do good authors speak of the populations of

SECTION VIII.

THE KELTS OF ILLYRIA.

Of these the chief were the Scordisci, a name of the same origin, in respect to its second element, as Taurisci. I have already stated that this is no true and undoubted Keltic form. Nevertheless, it may easily be the name of a Keltic population. It may be the name given to it by its neighbours. The non-Keltic character, then, of the forms in -isci is not the reason against Kelts forming a portion of the population of Illyria.

The true reasons lie in the insufficiency of the testimony as opposed to the à priori improbabilities, the absence of any internal evidence, and the positive facts that favour an occupancy other than Keltic. In other words, it is the criticism that applied to Noricum repeated, with the addition of a few special and peculiar remarks.

That the Scordisci were called Galatæ I believe; but I believe that the Galatæ implied by the name were the Galatæ of Gallicia; i. e. the Slavonic G-l-t, to speak generally.

Strabo's text claims notice. It runs οἱ Σκορδισκοι καλούμενοι Γαλαταί τοῖς Ἰλλυρικοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ τοῖς Θρακιοίς ὤκησαν ἀναμίξ (p. 313). See Zeuss, in v. i. *Illyrische Kelten*.

I submit that Galatæ was the national, Scordisci the geographical, name; and that out of the name Galatæ came the identification of them with the Kelts—Strabo himself writing οἱ Κελτοὶ οἱ αναμεμιγμένοι τοῖς τε Θρᾳξὶ καὶ τοῖς Ἰλλυριοῖς, p. 304.

With such passages as these in Strabo, and with a name so likely to mislead, the statement that the Scordisci were Kelts is not to surprise us, when it occurs (as it does) in several later and inferior writers.

The evidence, however, of the name along with the authority of Strabo constitutes the whole of the case in favour of the Scordisci being Kelts. All the rest seems to be either Strabo repeated, or the inference from the name drawn afresh.

SECTION IX.

That the Iapodes were a mixed nation, Keltic and Illyrian, is a doctrine that rests on the evidence of Strabo; the fact being admitted to be probable. Nevertheless, it is far from being unexceptionable. Polybius supplies us with a passage respecting the Veneti, a population closely akin to the Iapodes, which leads to the belief that what was called a Keltic and Illyrian intermixture was merely the mixture of certain Keltic and Illyrian characters. Between these there is a wide difference : ‘ Οἱ Οὔενετοι τοῖς ἔθεσι καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ βραχὺ διαφέροντες Κελτῶν, γλώσσῃ δ’ ἀλλοίᾳ χρώμενοι—ii. 17.

The Veneti were, almost certainly, in the same category with the Iapodes * ; and, as certainly, other than Keltic.

SECTION X.

The Bastarnæ.—The Bastarnæ of the Lower Danube are generally (though, probably, wrongly) considered Germans—Strabo, Tacitus, and Pliny being the chief authorities. This doctrine, however, has many complications, which reference to other writers increases rather than diminishes.

Livy's evidence makes them *Gauls;* since he calls their leader, in one place, Clondicus dux *Bastarnarum* (xl. 58), and in another (applying to the same series of events) Clondicus, regulus *Gallorum* (xliv. 26).

He also writes—" Per *Scordiscos* iter esse ad mare Hadriaticum Italiamque. Alia via traduci exercitum non posse. Facile Bastarnis Scordiscos iter daturos ; nec enim *aut lingua aut moribus æquales abhorrere.*"

---

* The special ethnology of the Iapodes is investigated by the Editor, in the Transactions of the Philological Society, vol. ix.

Plutarch does the same as Livy—ʽΥπεκίνει δὲ (nempe Perseus) καὶ Γαλάτας, τοὺς περὶ τὸν ῎Ιστρον ᾠκημένους, οἳ Βαστάρναι καλοῦνται.—Vit. Paul. Æmil. c. 9.

The Bastarnæ were distinguished from their neighbours— warlike as these were—by superior bravery, vast stature, and intense love of fighting—῎Ανδρες ὑψηλοὶ μὲν τὰ σώματα, θαυμαστοὶ δὲ τὰς μελέτας, μεγάλαυχοι δὲ καὶ λαμπροὶ ταῖς κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων ἀπειλαῖς. — Plut. Vit. Paul. Æmil. 12.

The fragment of Scymnus makes them immigrants or con- querors :—Οὗτοι δὲ Θρᾷκες, Βαστάρναι τ᾽ ἐπήλυδες.

I think that, along with the Scordisci, they were *Gallicians*. I also give considerable importance to the word ἐπήλυδες in the extract from Scymnus.

That Galatæ, of some kind or other, were occupants of the Lower Danube, is shown by other notices ; the chief of which is supplied by the famous Olbian Inscription ; wherein we find the name.

Has any one ever maintained that these Galatæ were any- thing but ordinary Gauls of Gallia, or at any rate closely allied tribes ?   I cannot say what every writer on the subject may have admitted or denied.   I lay, however, before the reader the following extracts from Niebuhr, and shall, in the sequel, notice the adhesion of Grote to the same doctrine.   I give Niebuhr's text *in extenso*, in order to suggest some reflections upon the criticism it embodies.   Speaking of the Scythians, he writes—

"At the time when Thucydides wrote, events were ripening in the west, which, in their progress and development, decided the downfal of the Scythian nation, and convulsed and desolated the whole of Europe from the Tanais to the Sierra Morena.

"'The name of the Triballian plain cannot have been confined to the narrow district of Syrmia, lying in the angle which the Angrus (the Drin), having its source in Illyria, forms by its con- fluence with the Brongus (the Sau).   It doubtless extended over the whole level country of Lower Hungary.   But though the Servians were, as regards their descent, quite unconnected with the Triballi, yet the Byzantine writers were not mistaken when, in respect of their place of abode, they called them by the latter name, as being a classical appellation ; for the Triballi dwelt, in

the time of Thucydides, on the confines of the Odrysian kingdom north of mount Scomius.   They were a Thracian nation.

"In the first year of the 101st Olympiad these Triballi, with all their disposable forces, to the number of 30,000 men, made an irruption into the territory of Abdera.   The events of this war I pass over; the only point connected with the present inquiry is their appearance at so great a distance from their former country in quest of new settlements; for we find them between Mount Hæmus, the sea, and the Danube, in the region which the Getæ still inhabited when Thucydides wrote his history—the province Scythia (*sic*) (Mœsia?) of the later Roman empire.   The Scythian king Ateas, who carried on war with the Istrians, and afterwards in Bessarabia with Philip, fought also with the Triballi: they attacked Philip on his return from the Delta of the Danube across Mount Hæmus: and after the Thracians had in vain attempted to repel Alexander from their country in the passes of these mountains, they placed their wives and children in safety in an island of the Danube named Peuce, which was formed by two mouths of the river.   This entire change of abode shows that Diodorus is quite mistaken in assigning hunger as the cause of their advance to the Thracian coast.   The men of military age, who would not submit to be the slaves of a savage enemy, set out in quest of a new country.

"The conquerors to whom they yielded their ancient settle-ments were the Gauls.   From a comparison of the Roman and Grecian chronology it was the twelfth year after the sacking of Rome when the Triballi appeared before Abdera; and in the reign of Philip, Scylax mentions Celts in the farthest recess of the Adriatic gulf, who had been left behind by the invaders in their march, *i.e.* in their march along the Danube, where after-wards the Scordisci dwelt, in Lower Hungary and in the terri-tory of the Servians, the descendants of the victorious Gauls. They and their kindred race in Noricum were the Celts who sent ambassadors to Alexander after his victory over the Triballi and Getæ."

Again—"In the new comedy, and even in Menander, Davus and Geta were nearly the most usual names of slaves: according, therefore, to the Athenian mode of naming them, we may infer that at that (though not at an earlier) time slaves from these nations were very numerous at Athens.   This was occasioned by wars, from which the captives were brought in troops to the great

markets, where, even though no hostility existed against the suf-
fering nation, they were treated like any other kind of plunder.
As to the race which reduced them to slavery, there can be no
doubt that it was the Scordisci, Boii, and other Gaelic and Cim-
brian tribes settled on the banks of the Middle Danube, by whom
they were brought into Greece through Illyria or Macedonia."

Again—"After this epoch these countries are for a long
time unnoticed in history: however, Olbia and the surrounding
region derive much light from the inscription of Protogenes,
of which the date alone is wanting.   In this, Olbia is re-
presented as sunk in great misery and distress, and completely
overwhelmed by a recent war with the Gauls (Γαλάται),
in which all the slaves in the country and the half Greeks on the
frontiers had been destroyed.   The city was threatened with an-
other attack, as the Gauls and Sciri had concluded an alliance ;
and it was generally reported that they would make an attack in
the winter.   At that season, when the ice was hard, the city
was exposed, for there was no wall towards the river and the
harbour : an omission which doubtless had not arisen from the
negligence of the first founders, but either from the prohibition
of the Scythian kings to build one, or the command of the Getan
kings to demolish it when built.   The project was frustrated by
the extensive fortification of the open country.   Olbia at that
time not only had reason to fear the Gauls, but also the Thisa-
matæ, the Scythians, and Saudaratæ, who were anxious to get
possession of that town in order to secure a convenient place of
defence against their formidable enemies.   At the same time a
certain king named Sætapharnes ruled over that region, whose
forbearance the Olbiopolitæ purchased by embassies and presents ;
and were compelled to humble themselves before him when he
appeared with his army on the opposite bank of the river, in
order to receive the tribute, which in the decree is called a gift.
The river is, beyond all question, the Borysthenes, and not the
Hypanis ; and the very name of Sætapharnes makes it certain
that he was a Getan, whose kingdom was to the east of the
Dnieper, being the successor of the Aripharnes already mentioned.
The Thisamatæ and Saudaratæ are nations which do not occur
elsewhere : the former name is probably in part compounded of
the same word as that of the Iaxamatæ on the lake Mæotis, which
Demetrius of Callatis considered as the same nation as the
Mæotians of the early writers ; Ephorus as a tribe of the Sauro-

matæ. The Scythians had by this time become so insignificant, that they only occur as a surviving horde in conjunction with two other nations, who were in search of a fortified city to protect their defenceless people against the Gauls.

"The period at which this latter nation first appeared in the neighbourhood of the Borysthenes would determine that of the inscription; for the whole tenor of it shows that the first terrors of invasion prevailed. But upon this point history supplies us with no information; on the contrary, the inscription is the first testimony we have of the Gauls having at any time inhabited and been lords of the Ukraine : and it serves to illustrate the name of the Celto-Scythians, which occurs in Strabo without explanation; and can now no longer be understood to signify the supposed contact of the great nations of ancient geography, but must mean the Celts in Scythia. Strabo quotes from Posidonius, that the Cimbri had advanced as far as the lake Mæotis, and I may venture to assume, as a point already proved, that these were Gauls in the extensive Roman sense of the word, which also comprises the Belgians, and even their companions the Teutones or Germans; and that they came not from the north, but from the east. These Cimbri are the Galatæ of the Olbian inscription; though they were as yet confined to the right bank of the Borysthenes, the left bank being included in the powerful kingdom of the Getæ. And I see no reason why their allies the Scirians, should not be the Scirians, who indeed do not occur for many generations after this time, and then as Germans, but who might, at this period, with other branches of their nation, be classed under the general name of Teutones."—*Researches into the History of the Scythians, Getæ, and Sarmatians.*

We shall not have seen the whole import of these over-long extracts until we have considered the Kelts of Spain or the Keltiberians: Then, and not till then, shall we see what is meant by the convulsions and desolations of Europe, "from the Tanais to the Sierra Morena." At present it is sufficient to draw attention to the enormous amount of locomotion and migration implied in the movements of the Cimbri and other populations. And all for what? For the sake of the name *Galatæ* and the non-recognition of the possibility of two populations having borne it.

7

SECTION XI.

TWO CLASSES OF GALATÆ.

The possibility, in the general way, of two populations bearing the same name, without being connected in their ethnology, has been already suggested.

So has the particular probability of the word *Gall-* being a name of the kind in question.

The present is as fit a time as any for introducing the details of this doctrine; both in respect to the conclusions to which it leads, and the evidence upon which it rests.

That the *original* Keltic area was bounded on the east by the Rhine, if not by some line west of that river, is, in my mind, almost certain.

That there was Keltic *intrusion, encroachment, conquest,* and *occupancy* beyond the limits of this original area is also certain.

That these, though important and considerable, were of no inordinate magnitude, I believe. In Italy I carry them far south—very far south indeed. In Rhætia, Vindelicia, and Noricum, I find traces of them. In Dalmatia these are just probable. For the parts beyond, I deny them altogether; admitting, however, that, before we can exclude them from Greece and Asia Minor, we must deal as boldly with the evidence of certain writers of antiquity, as critics of the opposite doctrine deal with time and space and *à priori* presumptions.

That these *à priori* presumptions are improved by changing the line of the migration, and accounting for the presence of Kelts in Wallachia, Russia, and similar improbable areas, by saying that it was the "movement from their original home in Asia which brought them there, so that they took these several places in their way to the west," is diametrically opposed to what I consider sound ethnological criticism; as may be seen in Section III.

Little better do I think of what many writers, with whom I unwillingly differ, seem to think highly philosophical and scientific, viz. those endless chains of cause and effect which the extracts from Niebuhr, in the preceding chapter, were especially made to illustrate; causes and effects which drive out nation after nation in the way that one wedge, or nail, drives another. A, attacked by B, attacks C, who is thrown upon D, who

evacuates his country, in order to take E's, who ejects F, who drives G, and so on to the end of the alphabet. All this is but the philosophy of the "House that Jack built," or the "Pig, Pig," that would not get over the stile, in the hands of learned men instead of children.

Now, as to the evidence that there were *K-lt*, *G-l-t*, or *G-l*, besides the members of what modern ethnologists call the Kelt stock, family, group, division, or class—

I ask, in the first place (and, if the answer be in the affirmative, a great deal of my doctrine must be abandoned) whether, without arguing in a circle, there is any evidence whatsoever of the present name of the Polish district called Gallicia being other than native, ancient, and (as such) Slavonic. Halicz is the Polish form; for which the Bohemian would be Galicz; the H becoming, by the law of the language (and not accidentally, or by assumption), G.

Then there is, near the mouth of the Danube, the modern town of Galacz. Is there any evidence that *its* name is other than native, and, if native, why not old. The argument in favour of its antiquity may be strengthened. In the time of the Athenian Republic, there was a *Kallatis* at no great distance, *i.e.* on the coast of the Euxine, to the south of the Danube. It was one of a Pentapolis, the others being Apollonia, Mesymbria, Odessus, and either Istrus, or Tomi.

Form for form, Kallatis is to Keltæ as Galacz to Galatæ.

Language for language, Kallatis and the country of the Gallic-speaking Gothini, either actually belonged to the same area, or were each in close geographical contact with it. The Gothini came in contact with the Sarmatæ, as we saw by the text of Tacitus. The people of Kallatis did the same, as we may see in Ovid; who, at Tomi, speaks oftener than once of the eastern members of the same stock :—

> Jam didici Getice *Sarmaticeque* loqui,
> Junctaque Parrhasiis *Sarmatis* ora Getis.

Place for place, there is a difference. Kallatis (like Galacz) is a town; the district of the Gothini was a country. The country, however, may have given the name to a city. Nevertheless, the difference constitutes an objection.

Notwithstanding, I hold that certain Sarmatians were described as Galatæ and Keltæ; more especially those of the Lower Danube, and most especially those of

SECTION XII.

THE GALATÆ OF THE OLBIAN INSCRIPTION.

The Olbian Inscription (I am all but transcribing Grote), the 2058th of Böckh's Inscriptiones Græcæ, records a vote of public gratitude to a citizen named Protogenes who had extricated the town out of many dangers and difficulties. It gives us the state of it. It was impoverished and distressed. Barbarians from the parts around impoverished and distressed it. Some were Scythians, some Sciri, etc., some Galatæ. The Olbians paid tribute to the former, and intermarried with them. The Scythian Prince Scyles was eminently Philhellene; too much so for his own good, for his partiality cost him his life. This placed the town in jeopardy. Corn was dear. The fortifications had to be strengthened. About fifty years B.C. it was sacked by the Getæ and deserted. The fugitives, however, returned, and Olbia grew up afresh—smaller and weaker. Still it revived, and was visited afterwards by Dion Chrysostom, who describes it.

I hold that these Galatæ were men who spoke the language to which the words Halicz, Kallatis, and Galacz belonged; this language being not Keltic, but Sarmatian, *i.e.* either Slavonic or Lithuanic.

With this remark we may return to the true Gallic frontier, for the part north of Switzerland, or Helvetia.

SECTION XIII.

KELTS OF WURTEMBURG—DECUMATES AGRI AND VINDELICIA.

The Decumates Agri were divided between the Helvetii and Boii, the former certainly, the latter probably, Kelts.

Afterwards, the history of the Decumates Agri is as follows:

First, *i.e.* in the time of Tacitus it was a district whither the malcontents of all the frontier states resorted. I think it was a debateable ground, or if not debateable, unappropriated.

Secondly, it became German, *i.e.* in the time of Probus, and, perhaps, earlier; when the Germans of the Upper Rhine encroached upon it.

This it has been ever since.

Whether the Kelts were the earliest occupants is another question. The text of Tacitus is, "Non numeraverim inter Germaniæ populos, quamquam trans Rhenum Danubiumque consederint, eos, qui Decumates agros exercent. Levissimus quisque Gallorum, et inopiâ audax, dubiæ possessionis solum occupavere. Mox limite acto, promotisque præsidiis, sinus imperii, et pars provinciæ habentur."

SECTION XIV.

KELTS OF BAVARIA—VINDELICIA.

There were some Kelts in Vindelicia, the testimony of more than one writer being to the effect that Vindelicia was a Keltic area; testimony which is strengthened by the local names Cambo-*dunum*, Arto-*briga*, and, perhaps, others. The Kelts of Vindelicia may have stretched into the northern parts of Noricum. *Carnuntum* was, probably, Keltic.

Whether they were the oldest inhabitants is another question. I think they were not. The text of Cæsar is against the notion of their having been so. " There was a time," he writes, " when the Gauls encroached on the Germans. The Volcæ Tectosages occupied and settled in a part of the Hercynian Forest. They are still there; continent, just, and warlike, and, like the Germans, frugal and penurious." Bell. Gall. 6, 24.

There is much to notice in this passage. First comes the division between what Cæsar might have known as a cotemporary witness and what he could only have heard from others. He might have known that the Volcæ Tectosages were occupants of a trans-Rhenane district, though even in this respect he might possibly be misinformed. In respect to the manner of their arrival thither, he was very likely to be informed. Say that there were Volcæ in both Gaul and the Hercynian Forest, and that the former were the intruders, who had become Gallicized, and the line of migration would be reversed, and Hercynian foresters who had settled in Gaul might pass for indigenæ; or, at any rate, the Gauls might choose to call them so. They might account for the appearance of the two populations in different areas by the statement that they (the Gauls) had penetrated into Germany, and

not certain Germans into Gaul.   The bearing of this will appear in the sequel.

The term is peculiar.   No undoubted Keltic name is like it. Few consist of two words.

In the next place, both the elements appear elsewhere.

Thirdly, they have not only no definite and straightforward meaning in any Keltic language, but have, partially, a non-Keltic look; inasmuch as *Volc* is equally like the Latin *vulg*-us, the German *folk*, and the Sarmatian *pulk*.

On the other hand, there is a point or two connected with them which is pretty clear.   It is clear that, of the two terms, the general one is *Volcæ*, the qualifying or specific one, *Tectosages*. This we learn from the division into *Volcæ Tectosages* and *Volcæ Arecomici*; for these are the names of two populations, which, though of no great prominence in the pages of Cæsar, from the fact of their having belonged to a part of Gaul which was reduced before his Consulate, are by no means to be overlooked.

The metropolis of the Tectosages was Tolosa or Thoulouse.

It is probable that the termination *ag* is non-radical, being the *eg* in such words as Brithon-*eg* and Saeson-*aeg*, etc.; Briton-*s* and Saxon-*s*.   If so, the inflection is more evidently Keltic than the root.   That the word is a Gallic gloss is clear.

Is may have been this, however, and yet the populations that bore it, have been other than Kelt.

This is as much as need be said at present.

SECTION XV.

KELTS OF BOHEMIA.

The existence of these will be investigated in the chapter on the Boii.

SECTION XVI.

THE GOTHINI.

In the forty-third section of the Germania of Tacitus we read, " Gothinos Gallica, Osos Pannonica lingua coarguit, non esse Germanos; et quòd tributa patiuntur: partem tributorum Sar-

matæ, partem Quadi, ut alienigenis, imponunt: Gothini, quò
magis pudeat, et ferrum effodiunt: omnesque hi populi pauca
campestrium, ceterùm saltus et vertices montium jugumque inse-
derunt."

Reasons for believing *Gallica* to mean Gallician have been
given in Section XI.

SECTION XVII.

KELTS OF THRACE, MACEDON, AND GREECE.

There is no want of evidence to the fact of battles having been
fought in Thrace, Macedon, and Greece, against populations which
good historians name Galatæ.   They were fought by the Mace-
donian kings and by the Romans.   They are noticed by Polybius,
by Livy, by Appian, by Athenæus, and by Pausanias.

On the other hand, they are generally stated to have been
fought against the Scordisci Galatæ, and the possibility of these
being Gallician has been indicated.

The sack of Delphi was effected by Galatæ.

Now, over and above the name, there are two material facts
which, from the numerous notices either of Galatæ *eo nomine*, or
of invasions of Greece from the north, command notice.   The
first favors the doctrine that they were Slavonians; the second,
the doctrine that they were Kelts.

1. The Costoboci were a population on the frontier of, or in,
Gallicia, and these in the time of Pausanias invaded Greece and
penetrated as far as Elatea (Paus. ix. 34).   I submit that this
evidence is to the fact of Gallicia being near enough to Greece to
supply an invasion of its soil.   I think, indeed, that these very
Costoboci may have been a detail of the Gallician name.

2. So unexceptionable an author as Polybius connects them
with a king with the undoubtedly Kelt name, Brennus.

I by no means undervalue this argument in favour of their
Kelt affinities.   Nevertheless, I take exceptions to it.   The notice
of Brennus is incidental.   He is not their leader.   Their leader
is Comontorius.   Who, then, was Brennus?   What Polybius says
is this—"These Galatæ (viz., those under Comontorius), moved
along with those with Brennus out of their own country."   He
continues—that having retreated from Delphi, they harassed the
neighbourhood of Byzantium, etc. (iv. 46).

Now if we look upon this Brennus as the cotemporary of Comontorius, we have no choice between gratuitously impeaching the accuracy of an excellent writer, and making his soldiers Gauls of Gaul.   But I submit that the Brennus meant by Polybius was the Brennus who sacked Rome more than 100 years before, and that all he meant to say was that the Galatæ of Comontorius were Galatæ of the migration under Brennus.   This is a matter in which a better ethnologist than any of antiquity might err.   He meant, I submit, to tell the Romans that the Galatæ who ravaged Greece were of the same stock as those who ravaged Italy.

Nevertheless, numerous authors read him as if he made the leadership of Brennus as much a matter of history as that of Comontorious.   Hence Pausanias and Athenæus make the former the actual commander during the war.

The question, however, has still to be further considered. The Galatæ of Thrace, Macedon, and Greece are, almost certainly, in the same category with the Galatæ of

SECTION XVIII.

KELTS OF GALATIA.

The history of the population from which the Asiatic district of Galatia took its name is obscure.   Niebuhr says this; adding that materials sufficient to elucidate it exist, but that they require putting together.   The following sketch is from his Lectures on Roman History (vol. ii. p. 188):—" In the spring of the year after this" (A.U.C. 562), " Cn. Manlius Vulso, the successor of L. Cornelius Scipio, anxious for an opportunity to undertake something from which he might derive fame and wealth—a desire which is henceforward the prevailing characteristic of the Roman generals—made a campaign against the Galatians, or Gallo-Græci, in Phrygia.   In the time of Pyrrhus, these Gauls had penetrated through Macedonia into Greece, as far as Delphi ; afterwards they went eastward to Thrace ; but whether they were, as the Greeks relate, induced to do so by fearful natural phenomena, or were attracted by reports about the delightful countries of Asia, is uncertain.   Many remained in Thrace, and ruled over the country ; but others, twenty thousand in number, crossed over into Asia, in two divisions, the one going across the

Hellespont, and the other across the Bosporus, and their enter-
prise was facilitated by the feuds of the Asiatic princes. There
they settled on the northern coast, in the territory about Ancyra,
in Phrygia, just as, at a later period, the Normans did in Neustria.
They inhabited thirty-three towns, in a country which, though
it seems to have been destined by Providence to be one of the
most flourishing and happy in the world, is now, under the despo-
tism of barbarians, like an accursed desert. They consisted of
three tribes, bearing the strange names of Trocmi, Tolistoboii,
and Tectosagæ. The first two seem to have been formed during
their wanderings, for they are not mentioned elsewhere. They
united with the Bithynians, where two small kingdoms were
growing up. The Bithynians were Thracians settled between
Nicomedia and Heraclea; during the time of the Persian domi-
nion they were governed by native princes, and after the dis-
solution of the Persian and Macedonian empires, the latter of
which had always been least consolidated in Asia Minor, they
extended themselves, and acquired considerable importance.
Nicomedes, then king, took those Gauls into his pay, there being
then only ten thousand armed men among them, defeated his
rival, and founded the Bithynian state, which gradually became
Hellenised. From that time, the Gauls sold their services to any
one who might seek them, and made the whole of western Asia
tributary to themselves. Their history is yet in great confusion;
but it can be cleared up, many materials existing for it. They
were defeated by Antiochus Soter, whereupon they withdrew into
the mountains, whence they afterwards burst forth whenever
circumstances allowed them, and all the neighbouring nations
paid tribute, to escape their devastations. But when the war
between Ptolemy Euergetes and Seleucus Callinicus, and after-
wards that between the former and Antiochus Hierax broke out,
they showed themselves thoroughly faithless, selling themselves
sometimes to the one, sometimes to the other, and were the
scourge of all Asia, until, to the amazement of every body, Attalus
of Pergamus refused to pay tribute, attacked and defeated them,
a fact which can be accounted for only on the supposition, that
through idleness they had become quite effeminate and unwar-
like, like the Goths whom Belisarius found in Italy. They never
entirely recovered from this blow, though they still continued to
exercise considerable influence, for Asia was always divided;
and although Antiochus was staying in those countries, he was

too much occupied to turn his attention to them, and would not, moreover, have been able to protect that part of Phrygia bordering on the district inhabited by the Gauls. Hence they still levied tribute far and wide, and after the fall of Antiochus, the Asiatic nations dreaded lest they should be unable to defend themselves. This gave Cn. Manlius an opportunity of undertaking a campaign against them, and to come forward as the protector of the Asiatics against the Galatians. His demand that they should submit had been answered by those barbarians with a *stolida ferocia*, and he accordingly marched through Phrygia, and attacked them in their mountains, without, however, extirpating them. They continued in those districts, and preserved their Celtic language for a remarkably long period. We find it even in the time of Augustus; but they, too, became Hellenised, and in this condition we find them at the time of St. Paul. The campaign of Manlius Vulso against them was most desirable to the inhabitants of Asia Minor; but on the part of the Romans, it was very unjust, for Manlius Vulso undertook it contrary to the express will of the *decem legati* who followed him to Asia. The war was brought to a close in two campaigns, but the Romans derived no advantages from it, except the booty, and perhaps a sum of money which was paid to them; for the countries between Western Asia and the districts of the Galatians were not subject to the Romans, but only allied with them. The Galatians suffered so severe a defeat, that from this time forward they continued to live in quiet obedience to the Romans."

There is no doubt as to the opinion of the writer of this extract respecting both the previous history and the ethnological affinities of these Galatæ of Galatia. They were the Galatæ of Macedonia, Greece, and Thrace. They were, doubtless, too the Galatæ of the Olbian Inscription. This is likely.

But they were also Kelts; inasmuch as their language is especially called Keltic.

This is problematic.

The material facts in favor of their being so (the name being held to prove nothing), are—

1st. The probability that they were the Gauls in whose history Polybius gives us the Keltic name Brennus. (See *preceding Section*).

2nd. The following passage from Livy—"Non plus ex viginti millibus hominum, quam decem armata erant. Tamen tantum

terroris omnibus, quæ cis Taurum incolunt, gentibus injecerunt, ut, quas adissent quasque non adissent, pariter ultimæ propinquis, imperio parerent. Postremo, quum tres essent gentes, Tolistoboii, Trocmi, Tectosagi, in tres partes, qua cuique populorum suorum vectigalis Asia esset, diviserunt. Trocmis Hellesponti ora data; Tolistoboii Æolida atque Ioniam; *Tectosagi* mediterranea Asiæ sortiti sunt, et stipendium tota cis Taurum Asia exigebant. Sedem autem ipsi sibi circa Halyn flumen ceperunt; tantusque terror eorum nominis erat, multitudine etiam magna sobole aucta, ut Syriæ quoque ad postremum reges stipendium dare non abnuerent. Primus Asiam incolentium abnuit Attalus, pater regis Eumenis."

This gives us the name Tectosagæ. (See *Section* xiv.)

3rd. The statement of St. Jerome, that the language of the Galatæ was that of the Treviri or people of Treves. (Prolegomen. lib. ii. ad Epist. ad Galat.)—"Unum est quod inferimus et promissum in exordio reddimus, *Galatas* excepto sermone Græco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur, propriam linguam eandem pene habere quam *Treviri*, nec referre si aliqua exinde corruperint; quum et Afri Phœnicum linguam nonnulla ex parte mutaverint; et ipsa Latinitas et regionibus quotidie mutetur et tempore."

4th. The names Ecco*briga*, Azitorizi*acum*, and Roslogi*acum*, in Galatia.

Singly, each of these is exceptionable. The extent to which the text of Polybius which speaks of Brennus is to be interpreted differently from the text which speaks of Comontorius has already been noticed.

The possibility of the Tectosages of Gaul having been intrusive has also been noticed. I do not, however, lay much stress on this. Let it be granted that they were Gauls. It is more material to observe that the name in Polybius is Ἀιγόσακαι. Of course, there has been no want of commentators who change this into Tectosagæ at once. But is this legitimate? On the other hand, Appian and Strabo give us Livy's form. And this is, probably, the right one.

Upon the text of St. Jerome, Niebuhr himself, Gallic as his doctrines are, writes—"St. Jerome says that he heard the same language in Phrygia as at Treves; but this cannot be referred to the Galatians, and St. Jerome probably saw Germans who had settled in Phrygia at different times, especially Goths, in the reign of Theodosius. It may be looked upon as an established

fact that *Treves was German,* and it is not likely that the Gallic language maintained itself in Asia down to so late a period."

The forms in *briga* and *acum* are important. At the same time it must be remembered that the Thracians have a form in *bria* (Mesem*bria,* etc.), of which *briga* (which is modern Slavonic), may be the fuller form.

Upon the name Tolisto*boii* I lay little stress. It may as easily be Slavonic as Kelt, as is shown in the sequel. Add to this, that it is only in the text of Livy that this form appears; a form suggesting the notion of the populations who bore it being Boii. Appian gives Τολιστόβιοι, Strabo and Ptolemy Τολιστό-βωγοι and Τολιστόβογιοι—forms which give us the -*boc* in Costo-*boc*-i; a name which has appeared in the preceding chapter.

Letting this, then, stand for nothing, we find that none of the points are unexceptionable. In Niebuhr's exception, however, I by no means join. On the contrary, I see in the text of St. Jerome a strong argument against my doctrine that the Galatians were Gallicians, or, at any rate, not Galli of Gallia,—strong, but not conclusive.

No one but those who have had special experience in the matter, know how utterly untrustworthy the most respectable informants are upon matters of language, in which there is the slightest dash of hypothesis. By one truthful and educated narrator I have been told that, when he landed some negroes in Australia, they could converse with the natives. He was evidently struck with the fact of the latter being blacks. From another I have learned that a crew of Bretons understood the natives of Tunis. How? Because the Kelt tongues were so like the Hebrew, and the Carthaginian was the same. This was my informant's belief, and he made the fact to match;—made and believed as much as if it were real.

Evidence, however, is evidence; and we must take it as we find it. Again, exceptionable as the facts are, there are three of them, and these three taken together prove more than three times as much as any one of them taken singly, the argument here being cumulative.

I state this, and leave the reader to draw his inference. Perhaps the evidence laid before him is in favor of the Kelt doctrine; and, perhaps, my own opinion to the contrary rests upon a foundation which the present notice has failed to display. I am inclined to think that this is really the case. A more than

ordinary unwillingness to assume a mile more of migration than is necessary, a more than ordinary unwillingness to adopt the statements of ancient authors upon matters beyond the range of their actual fields of observation, and a decided belief that the Sarmatian populations played a much greater part in the history of the ancient world than is usually assigned to them, have more to do with my conclusion than the actual objections that lie against the facts under notice.

There are, certainly, *some* errors in the ordinary accounts. Pausanias makes Brennus the actual leader. Justin takes his Gauls back to Tolosa. Mela makes the Rhone the boundary between the Volcæ and the Cavari. Meanwhile—

Ptolemy gives us in Galatia a place called Tolos*ta* (not Tolosa), or, in full, Tolosto*khora* (possibly a Slavonic Tolosto-*gorod*); whilst Polybius makes Cavarus the name of a king. Then the names *Trocm*-i and *Arecom*-ici are alike ; at least as much as *Tolisto-bogii* and *Tolosæ Boii*.

Finally, I should add that the names Volcæ, Tectosages, and Cavari, in Gaul, are, solely and wholly, geographical. Historical they are not. No one tells us anything that any one of them did. All that we are told is that there were certain localities eminently Greek and Gallic, and that certain towns were in their country— Tolosa in that of the Tectosages, just as Tolosta was in Galatia.

What if they had no existence except in the eyes of the geographers ? What if some of the more learned Gauls having heard that there were Gauls in Galatia, brought Galatia within the boundaries of the Hercynian forest, as part of *Gallician* Galatia actually was ?

There is error somewhere, and, in my mind, error to the extent here indicated. That the question is important is obvious. If the Galatians were actually Gallic, all the presumptions against the Scordisci, the Bastarnæ, and the Galatæ of the Olbian Inscription being Kelts, vanishes. If men from Gallia could be in Galatia, they could be anywhere.

What is the local dialect of the parts corresponding to the ancient Galatia ? What are the words foreign to the ordinary Turkish of the district ? What are the Galatian elements ? No one knows. When, however, they are known, the question will be settled. If Keltic, the whole Gallician, if Slavonic, the whole Gallic hypothesis, breaks down. Time will, perhaps, decide. Here follows in full the text of Polybius :—

'Αλλ' ὅμως τὸν μὲν ἀπὸ Θρᾳκῶν πόλεμον κατὰ τὴν συνήθειαν ἀναφέροντες, ἔμενον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς δικαίων πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας. προσεπιγενομένων δὲ Γαλατῶν αὐτοῖς τῶν περὶ Κομοντόριον 'εἰς πᾶν ἦλθον περιστάσεως.

Οὗτοι δ' ἐκίνησαν μὲν ἅμα τοῖς περὶ Βρέννον ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας· διαφυγόντες δὲ τὸν περὶ Δελφοὺς κίνδυνον, καὶ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, εἰς μὲν τὴν Ἀσίαν οὐκ ἐπεραιώθησαν· αὐτοῦ δὲ κατέμειναν, διὰ τὸ φιλοχωρῆσαι τοῖς περὶ τὸ Βυζάντιον τόποις. οἳ καὶ κρατήσαντες τῶν Θρᾳκῶν, καὶ κατασκευασά-μενοι βασίλειον τὴν Τύλην, εἰς ὁλοσχερῆ κίνδυνον ἦγον τοὺς Βυζαντίους. Κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐν ταῖς ἐφόδοις αὐτῶν, ταῖς κατὰ Κομοντόριον, τὸν πρῶτον βασιλεύσαντα, δῶρα διετέλουν οἱ Βυζάντιοι διδόντες, ἀνὰ τρισχιλίους, καὶ πεντακισχιλίους, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ μυρίους χρυσοῦς ἐφ' ᾧ μὴ καταφθείρειν τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. τέλος δ' ἠναγκάσθησαν ὀγδοήκοντα τάλαντα συγχωρῆσαι φόρον τελεῖν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἕως εἰς Καύαρον· ἐφ' οὗ κατελύθη μὲν ἡ βασιλεία, τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἐξεφθάρη πᾶν, ὑπὸ Θρᾳκῶν ἐκ μεταβολῆς ἐπικρατηθέν. ἐν οἷς καιροῖς ὑπὸ τῶν φόρων πιεζόμενοι. τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐπρέσβευον πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, δεόμενοι σφίσι βοηθεῖν καὶ συγχορηγεῖν εἰς τοὺς περιεστῶτας καιρούς. τῶν δὲ πλείστων παρολιγωρούντων, ἐνεχείρησαν ἐπαναγκασθέντες παραγωγιάζειν τοὺς εἰς τὸν Πόντον πλέοντας.

Of all possible literary forgeries, few have struck me as being more practicable than that of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians in the native language. It might so easily be found in some Armenian monastery; it might so easily be made up out of a Welsh and Irish Testament; it would so readily find defenders in the more Keltic parts of the earth, that we are fortunate in never having had our credulity tested by some unscrupulous and ingenious machinator. If the whole Epistle were too much, glosses on some Greek, Persian, or Armenian copy of it would be practicable; for which the existing interlineation of more than one MS. of the tenth century would be useful.

We have escaped, however, the fraud; and this is written to ensure, as much as possible, our escape for the future.

The northern frontier of Gaul now commands our notice, and brings us to

SECTION XIX.

KELTS OF BELGIUM, AND THE LOWER AND MIDDLE RHINE.

The Belgian area is made by Cæsar part and parcel of Gallia; but this is not sufficient to make the Belgæ Gauls. Aquitania is also part of Gaul; yet the Aquitani were no Kelts, but Iberians.

The chief positive fact in favour of the Keltic affinities of Bel-gium is, that the local names agree so closely in form with those

of the undoubted Gauls, as to be wholly undistinguishable. The
towns, etc., end in -*acum*, -*briva*, -*magus*, -*dunum*, and -*durum*,
and begin with *Ver*-, *Cær*-, *Con*-, and *Tre*-, just like those of
Central Gallia; so that we have—to go no further than the
common maps — Virio*viacum*, Minori-*acum*, Origi-*acum*, Turn-
acum, Bag-*acum*, Camar-*acum*, Nemet-*acum*, Catusi-*acum*, Gemini-
acum, Blari-*acum*, Mederi-*acum*, Tolbi-*acum*; Samaro-*briva*;
Novio-*magus*, Moso-*magus*; Vero-*dunum*; Marco-*durum*; Theo-
durum; *Ver*-omandui; *Cær*-esi; *Con*-drusi; *Tre*-veri—all Keltic
forms and compounds.

There would be no difficulty in the question, if it were not
for the following extract from Cæsar. " Quum ab his quærer et,
quæ civitates, quantæque in armis essent, et quid in bello possent,
sic reperiebat : plerosque Belgas esse ortos à Germanis, Rhe-
numque antiquitùs transductos, propter loci fertilitatem ibi con-
sedisse, Gallosque, qui ea loca incolerent, expulisse; solosque
esse, qui patrum nostrorum memoriâ, omni Galliâ vexatâ, Teu-
tonos, Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerint. Quà ex
re fieri, utì earum rerum memoriâ magnam sibi auctoritatem,
magnosque spiritus in re militari sumerent. De numero eorum
omnia se habere explorata Rhemi dicebant; propterea quòd pro-
pinquitatibus affinitatibusque conjuncti, quantam quisque mul-
titudinem in communi Belgarum concilio ad id bellum pollicitus
sit, cognoverint. Plurimum inter eos Bellovacos, et virtute,
et auctoritate, et hominum numero valere : hos posse conficere
armata millia centum; pollicito ex eo numero lecta millia LX,
totiusque belli imperium sibi postulare. Suessones suos esse
finitimos : latissimos, feracissimosque agros possidere. Apud eos
fuisse regem nostrâ etiam memoriâ Divitiacum, totius Galliæ
potentissimum; qui quum magnæ partis harum regionum, tum
etiam Britanniæ, imperium obtinuerit: nunc esse regem Galbam :
ad hunc propter justitiam, prudentiamque, summam totius belli
omnium voluntate deferri : oppida habere numero XII : polliceri
millia armata quinquaginta : totidem Nervios, qui maximè feri
inter ipsos habeantur, longissimeque absint : xv millia Atrebates :
Ambianos x millia : Morinos xxv millia : Menapios IX millia :
Calletes x millia : Velocasses et Veromanduos totidem : Adu-
aticos XXIX millia : Condrusos, Eburones, Cæræsos, Pæmanos, qui
uno nomine Germani appellantur, arbitrari ad XL millia."

Add to this the following notices, which, taken along with
the one just quoted, have, to many, seemed conclusive :—

Gallia est omnis divisa in tres partes; quarum unam incolunt Belgæ, aliam Aquitani, tertiam, qui ipsorum lingua Celtæ, nostra Galli, appellantur. Hi omnes lingua institutis, legibus inter se differunt. Gallos—a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit."—B.G. i. "Belgæ ab extremis Galliæ finibus oriuntur."—B.G. ii.

Strabo writes, that "the Aquitanians are wholly different from the other Gauls, not only in language, but in their bodies,—wherein they are more like the Iberians than the Gauls. The rest are Gallic in look; but not all alike in language. Some differ *a little*. Their politics, too, and manners of life differ a *little*:"—lib. iv. c. i.

The local names, however, are Gallic. Who supplied them? Probably the Belgæ themselves. If so, it is inconceivable that they should have used nothing but Gallic terms. If, however, they were *not* Belgæ, the inference is invalidated, inasmuch as Novio. *magus*, etc., may have been German towns under Gallic names.

But the names of the individual Belgian chiefs are as Gallic as those of the towns and nations, *e. g. Commius* and *Divitiacus*.

Upon the whole, I maintain that the Pæmani, etc., were members of a German confederacy; the word German being a political rather than an ethnological term.

Other facts, as well as the opinion of a safe authority, against the German character of the Belgæ, may be seen in the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, under the word *Belgæ (of Gaul)*.

Some lie in the indefinitude of Cæsar's language respecting these same Belgæ. In "describing the position of his troops during the winter of the year B.C. 54-53, he speaks of three legions being quartered in Belgium, or among the Belgæ, while he mentions others as quartered among the Morini, the Nervii, the Essui, the Remi, the Treviri, and the Eburones, all of whom are Belgæ in the wider sense of the term."

Others lie in the *reductio ad absurdum*. If every population which can be construed into *Belgian*, be German as well, several populations, whose Keltic character is beyond doubt, will be transferred from the Keltic stock, which is their right, to the German, which is their wrong, place. The Veneti will be in this predicament. So will the Mediomatrici of Lorraine; the Leuci, south of the Mediomatrici; and the Parisii of Paris. So will the Aulerci, and others.

Others lie in the expression of Tacitus concerning the Treveri and Nervii, *circa affectationem*, etc. "The Treviri and Nervii

affected a German origin, which, if it be true, must imply that they had some reason for affecting it; and also that they were not pure Germans, or they might have said so. Strabo (p. 192) makes the Nervii Germans. The fact of Cæsar making such a river as the *Marne* a boundary between Belgic and Keltic peoples, is a proof that he saw some marked distinction between Belgæ and Celtæ, though there were many points of resemblance. Now, as most of the Belgæ were Germans, or of German origin, as the Remi believed or said, there must have been some who were not Germans or of German origin; and if we exclude the Menapii, the savage Nervii, and the pure Germans, we cannot affirm that any of the remainder of the Belgæ were Germans."—*Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, v. *Belgæ*.

So much against the German character of the Belgæ of Gaul. The chief (perhaps the only) material fact in its favour is the following. The evidence that the Batavi and Caninfates, of Holland, were German, is very strong. Nevertheless, the Batavi formed part of the Gallia of Cæsar. More than this, the names of two Batavian localities, *Lug-dunum* and *Batavo-durum*, are clearly Keltic. There are more ways than one of explaining this. Thus, the towns may have come to us in their Keltic names only, the native ones having been unknown to the early geographers. Or, the original population may have been Keltic; the Batavi having been intrusive. I give this argument its full weight; nevertheless, I submit that the balance of reasons is against the Belgæ having been German.

Now comes a point of British ethnology. Cæsar writes that " the interior of Britain is inhabited by those who are recorded to have been born in the island itself; whereas the sea-coast is the occupancy of immigrants from the country of the *Belgæ*, brought over for the sake of either war or plunder. *All these are called by names nearly the same as those of the States they came from*, names which they have retained in the country upon which they made war, and in the land whereon they settled."— *Bell. Gall.* lib. v., cap. 12.

If the Belgæ, then, were Germans, many of the Britons must have been so as well.

Cæsar's statement is that there were certain Belgians in Britain; but he nowhere says that *Belgæ* was the name by which they were called.

Ptolemy gives us the name *Belgæ*, but he nowhere says that the population which bore it came from Belgium.

How far do these two authors mean the same population?

Ptolemy's locality, though the exact extent of the area is doubtful, is, to a certain degree, very definitely fixed. The Belgæ lay to the south of the Dobuni, whose chief town was Corineum (*Cirencester*). They also lay to the east and north of the Durotriges of *Dor*-chester. Venta (*Winchester*) was one of the towns, and Aquæ Solis (*Bath*), another; Calleva (*Silchester*) was *not* one of them; on the contrary, it belonged to the Atrebatii. This coincides nearly with the county of Wilts, parts of Somerset and Hants being also included.

The Belgæ of Ptolemy agree with those of Cæsar only in belonging to the southern parts of Britain. They are chiefly an inland population, and touch the sea only on the south and west; not on the east, or the parts more especially opposite Belgium.

The second name is that of the *Atrebates*. There were *Atrebates* in Britain. In Belgium there were *Atrebates* in *Artois*, which is only *Atrebates* in a modern form. Considerable importance attaches to the fact that, before Cæsar visited Britain in person, he sent Commius, the Atrebatian, before him. Now, this Commius was first conquered by Cæsar, and afterwards set up as a king over the Morini. That Commius gave much of his information about Britain to Cæsar is likely; perhaps he was his chief informant. He, too, it was who, knowing the existence of Atrebates in Britain, probably drew the inference which has been so lately suggested, viz., that of a Belgæ migration, or a series of them. Yet the Atrebates of Britain were so far from being on the coast, that they must have lain west of London, in Berkshire and Wilts; since Cæsar, who advanced at least as far as Chertsey, where he crossed the Thames, meets nothing but Cantii, Trinobantes, Cenimagni, Segontiaci, Ancalites, Bibroci, and Cassi. It is Ptolemy who first mentions the British Atrebates; and he places them between the Dobuni and the Cantii. Now, as the Dobuni lay due west of the Silures of South Wales, we cannot bring the Atrebates nearer the coast than Windsor, at most.

A further fact against the existence of any notably great German population in Britain lies in a well-known passage of Tacitus. Tacitus, who was fully as well informed in respect to the population of Britain as Cæsar, has a special speculation as to the existence of Germans in that island. He looks out for them.

How does he find them? Not in the plain straightforward way that he would have done had Cæsar's account been correct, and the whole south-eastern coast been German, but doubtfully, and by the circuitous method of an inference. He finds certain light-haired, big-bodied men, and accounts for their being so by the hypothesis of a German origin. *Where* does he find them? Not in Kent and Sussex, but in Scotland.

Upon the whole, the facts against the Belgæ of Britain being at one and the same time Belgæ from Gaul, and German in blood, largely preponderate against the conclusion to be drawn from the text and context of Cæsar. In my own mind his statement arose out of an *inference*—either one of his own, or one of his probable informant's, Commius. The same names appeared on both sides of the Channel, in Britain as well as in Gaul. Out of this fact arose, as a legitimate deduction, the identity or similarity of the two peoples; and, as a somewhat less legitimate one, the doctrine of a recent conquest from Belgium.

I will not absolutely commit myself to a similar doctrine in respect to Ptolemy; though, upon the whole, I think that it applies to him also. It is *likely* that his Belgæ were hypothetical; and that no population in Britain gave themselves that name. No traces of it exist. This, however, is of no great weight until it be taken with the difficulties of Ptolemy's text; which, although by no means inconsiderable when compared with those of Cæsar's notice, are still greater when we take it in detail:—" Next to these (viz. the Silures) the Dobuni, and their town Corineum. Next, the Attrebatii, and their town Nalkua. Beyond whom are the Cantii, the easternmost people. Amongst them are these towns: Londinium, Darvenum, Rhutupiæ. Again, south from the Attrebatii and the Cantii, lie the Regni and the town Næomagus. South of the Dobuni, (*i.e.* the parts about Corineum = Cirencester) lie the Belgæ, and the towns Ischalis, Hot Springs, Venta. Beyond these, on the west and south, are the Durotriges " (*i.e.* Dorsetshire).

Here we have more than one point of undoubted certainty, *e.g. Corineum = Cirencester, Hot Springs = Bath, Venta = Winchester;* to say nothing about others less universally admitted. Nevertheless, the Belgæ are a difficult population, lying as far west as Bath, as far east as Winchester—as far west as Bath, and yet having the Durotriges to the *west* also. Were there two towns named Venta for these parts, one in Hants, and the other

in Wilts ?   Not impossible, inasmuch as the word was a *common*, rather than a *proper* name, and there were *Ventæ* elsewhere, *e.g.* (a *Venta Icenorum*) in Norfolk.   Such and suchlike assumptions may reconcile the difficulties of the text of Ptolemy.   They will, however, not improbably involve a greater amount of complication and hypothesis than the simpler doctrine that Ptolemy's Belgæ, under that name, had no existence in Britain at all, but that the authority of Cæsar had led him to infer it, and also to place them in the south.   This, however, is a suggestion rather than a material fact.   The material fact is the non-Germanic character of any Belgæ that might have been there.   That there were *some* strangers is likely enough ; but that they were a separate substantive population, of sufficient magnitude to be found in all the parts of Britain where Belgic names occurred, and still more that they were Germans, is an unsafe inference.

It is likely, too, that there were *some* German elements in Belgium.   There may have been a German aristocracy.   Nevertheless, Belgium must be looked upon as essentially Keltic ground at the beginning of the historical period.

There were populations in

The Valley of the Rhine, which were, more or less, in the same category with the Pæmani, etc.   Such were the Treveri and Nervii of the following extract from the Germania of Tacitus :—

"Treveri et Nervii circa affectationem Germanicæ originis ultro ambitiosi sunt, tamquam, per hanc gloriam sanguinis, a similitudine et inertiâ Gallorum separentur.   Ipsam Rheni ripam haud dubiè Germanorum populi colunt, Vangiones, Triboci, Nemetes.   Ne Ubii quidem, quamquam Romana colonia esse meruerint, ac libentiùs *Agrippinenses* conditoris sui nomine vocentur, origine erubescunt, trangressi olim, et experimento fidei super ipsam Rheni ripam collocati, ut arcerent, non ut custodirentur."

The consideration, however, of the exact details of the minute ethnology of the frontier in question is no part of a notice so general as the present.

We know that if a given tribe was not Gallic, it was German ; and that, whether German or Gallic, it was on the frontier of the Gallo-German area.

The bearings of the nationality of the Treveri have been indicated in the preceding section.

SECTION XX.

THE LIGURIANS.

In writing on the Ligurians, in his Physical History, Dr. Prichard makes an observation that, whether made or not, whenever we find a gloss, should always be acted upon. He remarks upon the term *Λίγυες*, Ligur and Liguria (chap. iii., sect. ii.) that " the name admits an easy explanation in the Celtic languages. It may have been derived from *Llygwyr*, which means, in Welsh, *men of the sea-coast*. But if this was its real origin, it does not prove that the people were Celts, since the designation is one more likely to have been bestowed upon them by a neighbouring tribe, than assumed by themselves." That the supposed power of the word Ligur does not prove the people who were designated by it to be Kelts, is perfectly true. But it is also true that it proves nothing the other way. The term *coastmen* was just as likely to be applied by one Keltic tribe to another, as to one of a different stock. The term *Marchmen* was applied by Germans to Germans.

In the opinion of the present writer, the rules of ethnological evidence are in favour of the Kelts and Ligurians being referred to the same race.

The word Kelt itself, was, probably, Ligurian as well as Gallic and Iberic; *i.e.* it was probably used by the Ligurians, though not necessarily originating with them. And this use would be important, inasmuch as the Ligurians and the Greeks came in contact betimes. The Phocæans founded the colony of Marseilles; and it was not long before the parts along the coast, and to some distance inland, became imperfectly known. When Prometheus gives to Hercules the details of his travels westward, he says that, " You " (Hercules) " shall reach the fearless people of the Ligyes, where, with all your bravery, you shall find no fault with their warlike vigour. It is ordained that you shall leave your arrows behind. But, as all the country is soft, you shall be unable to find a stone. Then Zeus shall see you in distress, and pity you, and overshadow the land with a cloud, whence a storm of round stones shall rain down. With these you shall easily smite and pursue the army of the Ligyes."

Such is the gist of a quotation from a writer so early as Æschylus, in his drama of the Promctheus Unbound, as given by Strabo.

The history of one of the few Ligurian glosses we have, is curious, and instructive as well. It reads us a lesson of caution. Polybius gives us the word *Bodencos*. Pliny tells us it meant *bottomless* (*fundo carens*). In German, *boden* = *floor, soil, bottom*, etc. Dr. Prichard asks, more as a suggestion than aught else, whether instead of *c* we may not read *l*, so making the word *boden-los* = *bottom-less*, so, too, making the word German, and drawing our inferences accordingly in favor of an early German occupancy of Northern Italy.

Now, see how Sir F. Palgrave treats the word—" No small portion of the pleasure accompanying historical investigation, results from the stimulus afforded by the attempts to expound the dark riddle of past ages ; the more difficult the problem, the greater the interest attending its solution. Imperfect are the data upon which the etymologist investigates the early history of the great Teutonic and Celtic families, somewhat more extensive than the two words which include the whole pith of the Pictish controversy, but not very much more : he has to deal with scattered, scanty, and unsatisfactory materials ; usually a name of a town, mountain, or river—misheard by the stranger, misread by the author, or corrupted by the transcriber. *Bodenkos*, as we are told by Polybius, was the name given to the Po : *fundo carens*, is Pliny's interpretation. Metrodorus informs us that it was a Ligurian word. Is it not Celtic ? for there was a town *Bodin-comagus*—and we are asked whether *bodenkos* can be explained from the Celtic tongues ? Read *bodenlos*—amend the penman's error, and you will have a pure German term."—*History of Normandy and England*, vol. i., p. 40.

This is the way in which suggestions become opinions, and opinions facts ; ethnology suffering. The truth is that, whether the meaning *fundo carens* can be got from the German easier than from the Keltic, or from the Keltic easier than the German, the termination -*ncum* is both Gallic and British—being the termination of Habita*ncum* and Vapi*ncum*, localities where Germans are out of the question.

Let it be understood, then, that the high probability of the Ligurians having been Kelts is not disturbed by the word Bodencus.

SECTION XXI.

THE KELTS OF THE SPANISH PENINSULA.

We have already seen that some one in Spain called some one else by the name of Keltæ; that a population so called was to be found in the north and south of Portugal and elsewhere.

What is the inference from this? That these Keltæ were of the same stock with the Gauls? Not necessarily. At the present time, the word *Welsh* is German. It is applied to a population on the west of the German area, viz., the occupants of the Principality of Wales. It is applied to a population on the east of the German area, viz., the Wallachians of the Danubian Principalities. Are both these in the same class? No.

The Keltæ, then, of Spain may have been in a different category from the Keltæ of Gaul, notwithstanding the name, and notwithstanding it being a Spanish population to which it was first applied.

The testimony of the ancients is liable to the same objection. There were *Kelt*-iberians in the Spanish Peninsula; but who can say what *Kelt*- meant? The testimony, then, of antiquity is not conclusive.

Let us look to the internal evidence. The Kelt-iberians are placed, by Posidonius, at the head-waters of the Guadiana, in which parts they "increased in numbers, and made the whole of the neighbouring country *Keltiberic.*" This is the country on each side of the Sierra de Toledo, or New Castile, the very centre of Spain, and, as such, an unlikely place for an immigrant population, whether we look to its distance from the frontier, or to its mountainous aspect. They are carried, at least, as far north as the mountains of Burgos, and to the upper waters of the Douro on one side, and the Ebro on the other. So that Old Castile, with parts of Leon and Aragon, may be considered as Keltiberic. This is the first division.

In the south of Portugal comes the second, *i.e.*, in Alemtejo, or the parts between the Tagus and the Guadiana. Here are the *Celtici* of the classical writers.

The third section is found in the *north* of Portugal, and in the neighbourhood of Cape Finisterre. Here Strabo places the Artabri, and close to them *Celtici* and *Turduli* of the same nation

with those of the south, *i.e.* those of Alemtejo. His language
evidently suggests the idea of a migration. Such is the Keltic
area as determined by *external* evidence, and it cannot be denied
that it is very remarkable. It is of considerable magnitude, but
very discontinuous and unconnected.

The *internal* evidence is wholly of one sort., viz., that
which we collect from the names of geographical localities.
One of the common terminations in the map of ancient Gaul
is the word *-briga* (as in Eburo-*briga*), which takes the slightly
different forms of *-briva*, and *-brica*—Baudo-*brica*, Samaro-*briva*.
Now compounds of *-briga* are exceedingly common in Spain. They
occur in all the parts to which *Celtici* or *Celtiberi* are referred,
and in a great many more besides. Hence the internal evidence—
as far, at least, as the compounds in *-briga* are concerned—gives
us a larger Keltic area than the testimony of authors; indeed it
gives us the whole of the peninsula except Andalusia, a fact
which explains the import of a previous remark as to the absence
of compounds ending in *-briga* south of the Sierra Morena. It is
rare, too, in Catalonia—perhaps non-existent.

Tested, however, by the presence of the form in question,
Valentia on the west, and all Portugal on the east, were Kelti-
beric—as may be seen by reference to any map of ancient Spain.

But there are serious objections to the usual inference from this
compound. It is nearly the only geographical term in Spain, of
which the form is Keltic. And this is a remarkable instance of
isolation. The terminations *-durum*, *-magus*, and *-dunum*, all of
which are far commoner in Gaul than even *-briga* itself, are nowhere
to be found. Neither are the Gallic prefixes, such as *tre-*, *nant-*,
ver-, etc. Hence, it is strange that, if Spain were Keltic, only
one Keltic form should have come down to us. Where are the
rest? I am inclined to believe that the inference as to such a
Spanish name as, *e.g.*, Talo-*briga*, being Keltic, on the strength
of such undoubted Gallic words as Eboro-*briga*; is no better
than would be the assertion that the Jewish name Samp-*son*
was in the same category with the English names John-*son* and
Thomp-*son*. Such accidental resemblances are by no means un-
common. The termination *-dun* is as common in Keltic as the
termination *-tun* is in German. Yet they are wholly independent
formations.

Again, the same element may belong to two different lan-
guages. The root *n-s* appears in the *Naze* of Norway, and in

Orford-*ness*, where it is German. But it also appears in Tshuktshi-*noss*, and numerous other Russian names, where it is Slavonic. What if *briga* be Keltic and Iberic too?

The internal evidence, then, only partially and imperfectly confirms the external.

There are a few other facts connected herewith. In the modern name Gallicia we have the root *Gall*, and a Keltic locality as well. The internal evidence improves.

It is improved, too, by the fact of the French and Portuguese languages agreeing in the great extent to which they carry the abbreviation of the Latin forms, as also the nasal character of their phonesis; a fact which may or may not be explained by supposing them to have both taken the Latin as a graft on the same native form of speech.

The peculiarities of the local dialects of the Keltic districts have yet to be investigated.

Upon the whole, then, there is still something to be done before it is quite safe to make Portugal and portions of Spain Keltic, *i. e.* in the modern meaning of the word.

And, this being the case, the secondary question as to the relations of the Kelts to the Iberians loses importance—at least, in a work on Keltic ethnology. The question, however, exists: Are the Kelts the older or the newer population? If the newer, the displacement must have been enormous. If the older, whence came the Iberians? Current opinion makes the Iberians the aborigines; the doctrine of Niebuhr, the Kelts. It is not a question that opinions can decide. Indeed, as long as the Basque language remains as unknown as it is at present, the attempt to settle it is premature.

SECTION XXII.

THE KELTS OF ITALY.

We now come to an area upon which there was, in the opinion of all, something, at some time or other, Keltic; an area of extreme importance and interest, I mean Italy.

There were, certainly, Kelts in Italy.

As certainly, these Kelts were strangers and intrusive, rather than aboriginal.

How early, however, they intruded, and how far they ad-

vanced, are matters upon which there is anything but unanimity of opinion.

The writer who has done most towards the development of a true history of the Kelt invasion of Italy, is, without doubt, the present distinguished Professor of Latin in the University College, Francis Newman. That there were Kelts in Italy, who sacked Rome, and that they had been preceded by earlier members of the same stock, was currently known from the ordinary histories. It was also known that the Latin and Keltic languages had many words in common. The precise character of the Gallic invasions was as little brought under any effective criticism, as the precise character of the Keltic roots in the Latin tongue. It is upon this latter point that such good and useful work has been done by the above-mentioned writer.

In the Classical Museum (vol. vi.) he started from the previously-recognised fact of there being Keltic words in Latin, to the investigation of their nature ; and showed that, in a great number of cases, they were of comparatively recent origin, or *intrusive* ; *i. e.* that they stood in the same relation to the Latin that the Norman-French of our own tongue does to the English and Anglo-Saxon. They were not (what they might have been) words belonging to the original mother-tongue, and (as such) Indo-European in general, rather than Keltic in particular. Neither were they words of Latin origin, which, having found their way into the Welsh, from the Latin of Roman conquerors of Britain, took upon themselves the appearance of being originally Latin-Keltic.

They were nothing of this kind, but actual words, which, from some Keltic form of speech, had been taken up into some form of the early Latin. Could this have been after the taking of Gaul by Brennus ? or could it have been during the occupancy of Cisalpine Gaul by certain Keltic tribes ? It could not well have originated out of the Gallic wars during the last two centuries of the Republic ; still less out of the conquest of Gallia by Julius Cæsar.

They were actual Keltic words, because " in a large number of instances the words were members of *families* in Welsh," whereas they were " nearly isolated " in Latin.

Again, in several instances the Latin significations were secondary, or derivative, the primary one being " manifest in the Keltic. Sometimes the Latin is evidently corrupt or broken.

Thus *monile*, a necklace, is from the Gaelic *fail-muineul* or *scud-muineul*, the word *muineul* meaning *neck*."

A great proportion of these Keltic words were of the same kind as the Norman-French elements in English; *i.e.* they were the names of weapons, the names of certain political classes, the names of certain legal objects and the like.

Some of them were of great interest and importance. *Quirinus* and *Quirites*, essentially Roman, as are the ideas which they suggest, are not only possible, but probable derivations from a Gaelic root. " It, however, appears that (on whatever grounds) a particular branch of the Sabines was dedicated to the god of the spear, whom they called Quirinus, and themselves Quirites. Ancient authors represent them as settled at Cures, before they invaded Rome. Opinions were divided, whether the name Quirites came from Cures, or from the Sabine word *curis, quiris,* a spear : but until it is shown that Cures cannot also have come from the same root, there is no proved disagreement in the two explanations. We happen here to have a clue, which the Romans had not. The Gaelic language has numerous words in common with the Latin; and gives us Coir [sounded *Quîr*], *a spear :* Curaidh, *a warrior ;* the similiarity of which to Quir and Quirite sets at rest the question what Quirite meant."

Another point connected with this criticism was that that particular constituent of the Latin language which seemed to be most especially Keltic, was the Sabine; indeed the author allowed himself to use the term Sabino-Keltic, in speaking of the word *Quirinus*, the Sabine god of the *Quiris*, or spear, whose *cultus* was that of the Quirites.

Lastly—and this was the most unexpected statement in the whole doctrine—the particular division of the Keltic stock which seemed to have left its impression on the Latin was not, as might be expected *à priori*, the British, but the Gaelic. It was not the Britons of the comparatively eastern and southern countries of Britain and Gaul, but the Gaels of western Ireland and northern Scotland that pressed upon the occupants of the Sabine Hills and the frontagers of the Roman area on the Tiber; the doctrine running thus—

1. There was a Keltic element in the Latin, and that element was the Sabine. " The ultimate prevalence of the Latin over the Sabine tongue in Rome itself, even before the monarchy was extinct, testifies how small an element the Sabines were in the

whole Roman population. It may even suggest that, like the Normans in England, the lower Sabines, who had been mere clients before the conquest, often rose into nobles or patricians in Rome, and that the rest, by intermarriage with native Roman plebeians, gave birth to a progeny which, in Sabine estimate, had no claim to the sacred auspices and other nuptial ceremonies. Much obscurity rests on the question whether the plebeian Sabines in Rome, who were clients in the strictest sense, had or had not admission to Sabine religion, from which we know that the plebeians in Rome who were *not* Sabine were excluded. To *some* sacred rites they must have been admissible, since the connexion of Client and Patron was ratified by religion. The whole difficulty however vanishes, if we believe that in two or three generations the remaining clients of the Sabine patricians had 'lost caste' (as a Hindoo would express it) by intermarriages with the older population.

"Although, before long, the distinction of Romulian and Sabine was lost in Rome, yet, at first, it is credible, they dwelt principally in their own quarters. The name of the *Quirinal* Hill seems to mark it as a special abode of the people of Quirinus; but we have no reason to imagine that any legal regulation kept the two races apart.

2. The Sabines were Gaelic rather than British. "In attempting to judge for ourselves of the Sabine language, we have as data—1. certain words reported to us by the ancients as Sabine and not Latin,—or not without some modification; 2. words which we may probably conjecture to be originally Sabine, though incorporated with the tongue, first of Rome and hence of all Latium; viz. various politico-religious or military words. Both sets appear to me to indicate that the Sabines were Keltic, and Kelts nearer to the Gaelic or Erse than the Welsh branch. Although the subject cannot be here fully treated, illustrations may be given from the latter source. The letters G. W. stand for Gaelic and Welsh.

MILITARY AND POLITICAL OR RELIGIOUS WORDS, MANY OF WHICH
ARE LIKELY TO HAVE BEEN SABINE.

Arma ......G. arm.	Telum ......G. tailm.	
Gladius ...G. claidheamh.	(root *Tal*, cut).	
W. cleddyv.	Hasta ...	E. astas, astal.
Lamina ...W. llavn.	Hastile...	W. aseth, asethol.
G. laun.		*Germ*. ast.

Galea ......E. galia.

Scutum......G. sgiath.

Tragula......E. treagh, *a spear; trident* or *fish-spear.*

Cohors ......G. gort (*enclosed place*).

Caterva ...W. catorva, = cad torva, *battle-troop.*

Catapulta* = G. cath tabhal, *battle-sling.*

Sagitta ......G. saighead.

Parma ......W. parvais.

Pilum ......W. pilwrn.

Lorica ......G. luireach.

Balteus......G. balt.

Murus ......W. mur.

Mœnia ......W. maen, *a stone.*

Vallum......W. gwal. G. fal, and balle

Præda ......W. praidh, *a herd; booty.*

Spolia ......G. spùill.

Torquis......W. torch.

Monile ......G. fail-muineil.

Corona ......G. W. coron.

Catena ......W. cadwen.

Carcer ......W. carcher.

Turma ... } W. torva, tyrva.
Turba ... }

Numerus ...W. niver.

Gloria ......G. gloir.

Clades ... } W. llaith.
Lethum }

Miles ......W. milwr.

Centurio ...W. canwriad

Castrum ...W. cader, *strong;* caer, *castle.*

Cuspis ......G. cusp, *a kibe;* cuspair, *a marksman.*

Rex ....G. righ.

Populus ...W. pobl. G. pobull. E. pobal?

Senatus ...G. seanadh.

Quirit ......G. curaidh

Quiris ......G. coir.

Curia ......*French* cour. G. cùirt, *court.*

Tribus ......G. treubh. W. trev. *village and its land.*

Lex ....G. lagh, and dlighe.

Fas ....W. fas, *a band or fastening; whence* fasg, *bundle.*

Jus ....G. dior, *suitable, becoming.* E. deas and dior.

Cives......... *comrades and equals.* W. cyvu, *to unite in equality.*

Plebs........W. plwyf and lliaws; cf. λαός.

Ritus........W. rhaith? (*oath and law*) rhei-thio, (*to establish a rule*).

Ordo........W. urdh

Seculum ...W. sicl, *a wind, a round.*

Bulla ......G. bulla.

Toga........W. twyg,

Pallium ...G. peall, *shaggy hide.*

Carmen......G. gairm, *a proclamation.*

Amtruo......W. amtroi, *to turn round.*

Augur, *probably from* auca, *a bird* (in Gaulish) and cur, *care* (in Welsh) G. curam.

Tripudium, *from* tir, *earth, and* put, *to push, i.e.,* strike? Gaelic.

Repudium, *from* put, *to push.*

Faustus......W. fawdus, *fortunate,* faw, *brilliant,* fawd, *good luck.*

* The Greek derivation from πάλλω is highly doubtful.

" In the Classical Museum (before referred to) I have tried to show that these names of warlike and political things *are* native to Keltic, while very few of them bear marks of being native to Latin. I have also essayed to explain some other known Sabine words by the Gaelic or Gaulish."

This, however, is not the only evidence on this point. Great stress is laid on the " following table of numerals :—

	Latin.	Welsh.	Gaelic.	Æolic Greek:
One	Uno	Un	Aen	Hen
Two	Duo	Dau	Do	Duo
Three	Tri	Tri	Tri	Tri
Four	Quatuor	Peduar	Keathair	Pisur, Petor
Five	Quinque	Pump	Kuig	Pempe
Six	Sex	Chwech	Se	Hex
Seven	Septem	Saith	Secht	Hepta
Eight	Octo	Wyth	Ocht	Octo
Nine	Novem	Naw	Noi	Ennea
Ten	Decem	Deg	Deich	Deka
Twenty	Viginti	Ugain	Fichid	Veikosi
Hundred	Centum	Cant	Kett	Hecatonta
Thousand	Mille	Mil	Mile	Chilio

" In these numerals, we may note that the Greek is more re-mote from Latin than is either Keltic tongue, as to the numbers 1, 7, 9, 20, 100, 1000; more remote than Gaelic as to 4, 5, 6 (observing that the initial S in Sex is a more marked feature than the final *x*), while barely in the numbers 2 and 8 has it appreciable superiority to Gaelic.

" Equally do the Saxon and German numerals recede more from Latin than the Gaelic does. Nor in fact of all the Indo-European tongues has *any* so near a likeness to the Latin as the Gaelic has."

The question that arises out of the perusal of this table, is one that the author does not seem to have asked himself; neither does any one else seem to have asked it. Still it should be put.

What is the evidence that the Irish numerals are not of Latin origin? None. Opinion is decided against their being so; but who has ever recognised the alternative? In my own mind, I think it highly probable that the words in question may be no older than the time of St. Columba.

I admit, however, that the statement, as made by Mr. New-

man, to the effect that a great many Latin words are Gaelic
rather than Welsh, does not stand or fall by the numerals. Still
the presumption is so strong against the Sabine affinities being
Erse, or Gaelic, that I can scarcely admit the facts in its favour
to be conclusive.

A Gaelic occupancy within the limits of Italy would not only
give us the most southern limit of the Keltic area, but it would
give us the most eastern also; to which the real and undoubted
Gaelic of Scotland and Ireland are, in respect to their geography,
in direct contrast. The Scotch Gaelic is the most northern sec-
tion of its family, the Irish the most western. Between these
and the supposed Gaelic of Italy there is not only the sea, but
England and France; and not simply England and France, but
British England and *British* France, no portions of which have
ever been shown to have been Gaelic, however much a previous
Gaelic occupancy has been suggested in the way of a not very
tenable hypothesis.

Were both branches of the Kelt stock Italian? It is sug-
gested that they were. If some forms are decidedly more Gaelic
than British, others are more British than Gaelic. Hence the
doctrine that whilst the Sabines were Erse, the Umbrians were
Welsh, is suggested.

The opinion to which facts like those embodied in the fore-
going doctrine, along with a close consideration of the ethnology
of Ancient Italy, have led me, is as follows :—

1. That there were Kelts in Italy as far south as Samnium, and
that long before the historical, or even the legendary period, long
before Brennus and Camillus, long before Sigovesus and Bello-
vesus, long before the age assigned to Tarquinius Priscus, or even
Romulus.

2. That Sabine legends or traditions, as opposed to Roman and
Etruscan, give us, as far as they give any history at all, one of
two things—either the actions of actual Kelts in the country of
the Sabini, Latium, and elsewhere, or else actions of the native
populations and their allies; these latter being Kelt in their re-
lations, though not in substance.

3. That, as far as the Sabines were other than Latin, and as
far as the Samnites were Sabine, both were Kelt.

4. That no migrations from Gaul, such as those attributed to
Brennus and Sigovesus, are necessary; the history of the
Gauls in Italy, up to the date of the Samnite wars, being simply

that of the internal movements of a large and widely-spread population, long settled.   The sack of Rome forms no exception. The Gauls who effected it may have been Italian populations of as long standing as the Etruscans.   On the other hand, secondary migrations from Gaul may have been numerous, inasmuch as the present statements only go to the extent of making detailed invasions like those of the ordinary histories unnecessary.

5. That a great deal of Keltic legend, and some Keltic history, became transformed in the history of Rome, when the Latin language first began to preponderate over the Kelt and Etruscan. *Mutatis mutandis*, this applies to the Etruscan also.

6. That the Latin element of the Roman name was of comparatively slight importance until the time of Camillus, is highly probable.   That Rome was just as little Latin as the German towns of the Baltic provinces of Russia—Mittau, Revel, Riga, etc.—are Lett, or, as previous to the time of Peter the Great, they were Russian, is also probable.

The basis for this doctrine lies in the phenomena pointed out by Professor Newman, and others of a like kind ; in the number of local names which seem to be either Keltic, or compounded of Keltic elements (a number too large to be accidental); and, thirdly, the facts that history itself presents to us.   At the beginning of the actual, undoubted, and undeniable historical period, the greater part of northern Italy is actually Gallic, so much so as to bear the name of Cisalpine Gaul.   At the beginning of the possibly historical period (by which I mean the times of Camillus and the sack of Rome), there are Gauls so far south as the Liris, Gauls in Latium, Gauls in Etruria.   It is these three kinds of facts which form the basis of our reasoning—reasoning upward, ascending from effects to causes ; after the fashion of the reasoning of archæologists and geologists, and not after the manner of historians.

In respect to their history, the chief text is from Livy, which is as follows :—

" De transitu in Italiam Gallorum hæc accepimus.   Prisco Tarquinio Romæ regnante, Celtarum, quæ pars Galliæ tertia est, penes Bituriges summa imperii fuit : ii regem Celtico dabant. Ambigatus is fuit, virtute fortunaque cum sua, tum publica, præpollens, quod imperio ejus Gallia adeo frugum hominumque fertilis fuit, ut abundans multitudo vix regi videretur posse.   Hic magna natu ipse jam, exonerare prægravante turba regnum cupiens,

Bellovesum ac Sigovesum, sororis filios, impigros juvenes, missurum se esse, in quas dii dedissent auguriis sedes, ostendit. Quantum ipsi vellent, numerum hominum excirent, ne qua gens arcere advenientes posset. Tum Sigoveso sortibus dati Hercynii saltus: Belloveso haud paullo lætiorem in Italiam viam dii dabant.

"Is, quod ejus ex populis abundabat, Bituriges, Arvernos, Senones, Æduos, Ambarros, Carnutes, Aulercos, excivit. Profectus, ingentibus peditum equitumque copiis, in Tricastinos venit. Per Taurinos saltusque invios Alpes transcenderunt: fusisque acie Tuscis haud procul Ticino flumine, quum, in quo consederant, agrum Insubrium appellari audissent cognomine Insubribus pago Æduorum, ibi, omen sequentes loci, condidere urbem: Mediolanum appellarunt.

"Alia subinde manus Cenomanorum, Elitovio duce, vestigia priorum secuta, eodem saltu, favente Belloveso, quum transcendisset Alpes, ubi nunc Brixia ac Verona urbes sunt (locos tenuere Libui) considunt.

"Post hos Salluvii prope antiquam gentem Lævos Ligures, incolentes circa Ticinum amnem.

"Penino deinde Boii Lingonesque transgressi, quum jam inter Padum atque Alpes omnia tenerentur, Pado ratibus trajecto, non Etruscos modo, sed etiam Umbros agro pellunt: intra Apenninum tamen sese tenuere.

"Tum Senones, recentissimi advenarum, ab Utente flumine usque ad Æsim fines habuere. Hanc gentem Clusium, Romamque inde, venisse comperio."

To this add the following passage from Polybius:

Ταῦτά γε τὰ πεδία τὸ παλαιὸν ἐνέμοντο Τυρρηνοί . . οἷς ἐπιμιγνύμενοι κατὰ τὴν παράθεσιν Κελτοί, καὶ περὶ τὸ κάλλος τῆς χώρας ὀφθαλμιάσαντες, ἐκ μικρᾶς προφάσεως μεγάλῃ στρατιᾷ παραδόξως ἐπελθόντες, ἐξέβαλον ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὸν Πάδον χώρας Τυρρηνοὺς καὶ κατέσχον αὐτοὶ τὰ πεδία. Τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀνατολὰς τοῦ Πάδου κείμενα Λάοι καὶ Λεβέκιοι, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἴσομβρες κατῴκησαν, ὃ μέγιστον ἔθνος ἦν αὐτῶν, ἑξῆς δὲ τούτοις παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν Κενομάνοι· τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδρίαν ἤδη προσήκοντα γένος ἄλλο πάνυ παλαιὸν διακατέσχε, προσαγορεύονται δὲ Οὐένετοι . . Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Πάδου τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἀπεννίνον πρῶτοι μὲν Ἄνανες, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Βοιοὶ κατῴκησαν· ἑξῆς δὲ τούτων ὡς πρὸς τὸν Ἀδρίαν Αἴγωνες· τὰ δὲ τελευταῖα πρὸς θαλάττῃ Ξήνωνες.—Polyb. ii. 17.

That many of the geographical terms in Central Italy are Keltic, I believe.

I believe that the word *Aborigines* itself is. Against

the current notion there is a strong argument in the form
it takes in Greek. It is only in the later writers that it is
translated 'Αυτόχθονες, and here it is not the name of a people;
except in the way that, at the present moment, the term
Aborigines of Australia (or America) is the name of a people; a
way that makes it no name at all.

Anterior to the appearance of the word in any Latin writer,
Lycophron makes Cassandra predict that Æneas will build thirty
castles in the land of the *Borigoni*. Callias, too, speaks of
Latinus, the king of the *Aborigines* (not of the *Autochthones*).

Now, if we believe that the Greek writers, Callias and
Lycophron, took their terms, *Borigoni* and *Aborigines*, from
a Latin dialect, we may continue to believe that the word in
question is a *bonâ fide* Latin word. But if we do so continue to
believe, we must also hold that, in the time of those writers,
two facts had taken place.

1. That there was a sufficient amount of ethnography in
Rome to evolve a term so abstract as *Aborigines*.

2. That the term so evolved was taken by the Greek writers
from the Latin ones, not for what it was (*i.e.* the equivalent to
'Αυτόχθονες), but for what it was not (*i.e.* a true proper
name).

Considering the difficulties attending these suppositions, I
come to the conclusion that, both in the Greek language and in
the Latin, the term represented by *Aborigines* and *Borigoni* is in
the same predicament with the term *sparrow-grass* in English;
i.e. that it is a word indigenous to neither language, but that it
is an instance of *adoption with transformation* from a third.

Passing over the particular question as to whether the Latins
incorporated the term from the Greeks, or the Greeks from the
Latins, as of subordinate importance, the problem to be solved
is the language to which the word was indigenous; *i.e.* the
language which was to the Latin and Greek, as the Latin
language, with its term *asparagus*, is to the English with its
term *sparrow-grass*.

The conditions under which such a language must come are
as follows :—

1. It must have been spoken sufficiently near the locality of
the people in question to have contained a name for either the
locality or its inhabitants.

2. It must have been a language from which, either directly

or indirectly, one of its words might be incorporated with either the Latin or the Greek language—probably with both.

In other words, it must have been an Italian language, and at the same time a language neither Greek nor Latin.

Laying the Ligurian out of the question, and precluding ourselves from assuming the existence of any wholly new language for the existence of which we have no proofs, we find only two languages that come under this category.

a. The language of Etruria.

b. The language of Cispadane Gaul.

Which of these two tongues is the likelier to have supplied the term in question depends upon the view we take of its history. If the Latins took it in a direct way, and not from the Greeks, or if the Greeks took it from their colonies on the Tyrrhenian Sea, the *à priori* probabilities would be in favour of the Etruscan. On the other hand, if Latin writers (like Cato) took it from Greek writers (like Callias), and if the Greeks got it from their settlers on the Hadriatic Sea, the likelihood would be in the other direction ; *i.e.* the Keltic would be the language in which we should look for it.

Cæteris paribus, however, the language that will supply the best meaning to the word is the language from which it should be derived.

Now the Keltic supplies the data for the following hypothesis :

That the *Abor-* in Aborigines, or the *Bop-* in Βορίγονοι, is the *Aber-* in Scotch words like *Aber*-nethy, and in Welsh words like *Aber*-ystwith ; the locality to which it applied being either the confluence of the rivers *Anio* and *Tiber*, or the mouth of the Tiber.

Hence the hypothetical name was some word not very unlike the word *Aber-ygyn* or *Aber-ygwyn*, the latter half of the compound not being accounted for, and a flaw in the argument being thereby left, upon which others will probably lay more stress than is laid by the author.

Such, however, is the hypothesis. Assuming its truth, we limit the inferences deducible from it. It does not prove that the Aborigines were Kelts. This they may or may not have been. It only proves that Kelts were in the neighbourhood.

Umbria, by a parity of reasoning, gives us the root *-mb-* in Humber, another Keltic gloss ; proving that there were Kelts on the Umbrian frontier who used the word ; proving, too, that they

lay on the side of Rome, inasmuch as the word was adopted by
the Romans. But it was also adopted by the Greeks of the Adriatic
—so, at least, I infer from the use of the word in Herodotus.
If so, there were Kelts on both frontiers. More probably, how-
ever, the Umbrians themselves were more or less Keltic—
intrusive, of course.

That the Eugubine tables contain a language allied to the
Latin no more proves the exclusion of a Keltic form of speech
than an English inscription from Edinburgh would prove the
absence of any Gaelic in Argyleshire.

The notice of the Aborigines leads to that of the *Prisci*, or
(as they are oftener called) Prisci Latini.

There is no doubt as to the difficulties engendered by this
combination.

To suppose that it meant the original area of Latium in its
oldest and most restricted sense (of Latium, *minus*, the countries
of the Volsci, Ausones, Æqui, and Hernici; of the Latium
Antiquum of Pliny, as opposed to his Latium Adjectum) is to
ignore the fact of its having all the appearance of being an old
word.

On the other hand, the notion that it meant the towns founded
from Alba, as opposed to Alba itself, is at variance with the idea
conveyed by the terms metropolis and colony.

Niebuhr, holding that *Prisci Latini* is the same as *Prisci et
Latini*, makes the former word the name of a nation, adding in
a note that it would be absurd to suppose that *Prisci Latini*
meant *ancient Latins*. The Prisci he himself identifies with the
Aborigines of Varro, Varro (followed by Dionysius) having de-
duced the people so-called from the Sabine frontier, and con-
ducted them to the parts about Alba as a conquering nation, the
nation whom they conquered having been the Siculi.

Now there is an assumption that runs throughout all the
trains of reasoning upon this term which, general as it is, is by
no means legitimate. It is to the effect that, in the combination
Prisci Latini, it is the former word which qualifies the latter,
and not the latter that qualifies the former. Hence, the mean-
ing given is, the *Latins who were Priscans*, or *the Priscan Latins*,
rather than the *Prisci who were Latin*, or the *Latin Priscans*.

Yet no one translates *Suessa Pometia* as the *Pometia* that was
Suessa; but, on the contrary, every one renders it, *Suessa that was
Pometia*; for there are two towns so-called; the Suessa Pometia,

i.e. the Pometian Suessa, and the Suessa Aurunca or the Auruncan Suessa.

In these pair of words it is undoubtedly the qualifying word that comes last. There are more Suessæ than one. Why not more Prisci also?

In like manner Tarquinius Priscus = Tarquin who was Priscan (whatever be the meaning of the term), rather than Priscus who was Tarquinian.

This exception makes it possible that the Prisci Latini, notwithstanding their name, were other than Latin—or Latin only in respect to their geography and denomination. Were they Kelt or Etrurian? This is another question. The application of the name to Tarquin is in favour of their being Etrurian.

SECTION XXIII.

THE BOII.

The Keltic *areas*—actual, probable, and possible—have been noticed.

Certain details—actual, probable, or possible—of the Keltic name still stand over for investigation. It is only the more important of these that claim attention.

Two questions connect themselves with the name *Boii*.

1. Was the population Keltic, and, if so, was the name Keltic also? It would be hyper-criticism to deny that *some* Boii were Kelts. There are reasons, however, which forbid us to make them all so.

In the time of Attila and his Huns, the name Boisci (see Zeuss, *in voc. Hunni*) appears in Scythia; a country where Slavonian names abounded,—a country, indeed, which many of the Eastern Galatæ occupied.

In the Russian maps of the Government of Caucasus and Circassia, we find the word *Boisci*, where, in English, we should find the word *Kossacks*, denoting the occupants of a military settlement.

In a passage of Constantine Porphyrogenita (Zeuss, v. *Serbi*, *Chorwati*), there is the statement that the parts about Bavaria (Βαγιβαρεία) were called by the *Slavonic* occupants Βοίκι, and that these parts were on the frontier of the Frank Empire. As such they might be a *March*.

So might any, and all, of the Boian occupancies of Gaul, Germany, and Italy.

Let us say, then, that, *provided we can show reason for believing that there were Slavonians, to give the name*, on the frontiers of the Boii of Cæsar and other writers, we have made out a *primâ facie* case in favour of the word itself being Slavonic. If so, it may have been applied to Kelts, and to populations other than Keltic; a fact which should regulate our criticism, when we find not only Boii in more places than one, but Deserta Boiorum— Deserta possibly meaning Marches, or Debateable Lands.

2. What are the modern countries to which the Boii gave these names? Or is there only one? The usual doctrine makes only one; at any rate, it takes but little cognizance of the second. The criticism rests chiefly on the following passage from Tacitus :—

"Nunc singularum gentium instituta, ritusque, quatenus differant, quæ nationes e Germaniâ in Gallias commigraverint, expediam. Validiores olim Gallorum res fuisse summus auctorum divus Julius tradit: eóque credibile est, etiam Gallos in Germaniam transgressos. Quantulum enim amnis obstabat, quominus, ut quæque gens evaluerat, occuparet permutaretque sedes promiscuas adhuc, et nullâ regnorum potentiâ divisas? Igitur inter Hercyniam silvam, Rhenumque et Moenum amnes, Helvetii, ulteriora Boii, Gallica utraque gens, tenuere. Manet adhuc *Boiemi* nomen, significatque loci veterem memoriam, quamvis mutatis cultoribus."—*Germania*, § 28.

Word for word *Boiemum* is *Bohemia*. Nor is Tacitus the first writer who uses it. Velleius Paterculus had done the same.

Boio-hem-um is truly and unequivocally German—a German gloss. The *-hem = occupation, residence*, being the same word as the *-heim* in *Mann-heim* in High German; the *-hem* in *Arn-hem* in Dutch; the *-um* in *Dokk-um* in Frisian; the *-ham* in *Threking-ham* in English. Hence *Boi-o-hem-um = the home of the Boii*.

Some of the other compounds of the root *Boi-* are interesting.

Be-heim-are, a triple compound, combines the elements of both *Ba-varia* and *Bo-hem-ia*, and stands for *Be-heim-ware =* the *occupants of the home of the Boii*.

Boe-manni = the Boian men.

Beo-winidi = the Boian Wends, or Slavonians.

Ptolemy's form is $Baιvoχaι̂μαι$; a form taken from some dialect where the *h* was pronounced as a stronger guttural than elsewhere.

Word for word, and element for element, *Boiohemum* = *Bohemia;* but whether the *localities* coincide as closely as the forms of the *name*, is another question. It has been too readily assumed that they do.

It cannot be denied that identity of name is *primâ facie* evidence of identity of place. But it is not more. Hence, although it would be likely enough, if the question were wholly uncomplicated, that the *Boiohemum* of Paterculus and Tacitus were the *Bohemia* of the present century, doubts arise as soon as the name and the description disagree, and they increase when the identification of either the Boii, or their German invaders, with the inhabitants of Bohemia leads to ethnological and geo-graphical difficulties.

All this is really the case.

The disagreement between the name *Boio-hem* and the position of the present country of *Bohemia*, meets us in the very passage before us. The former lies between the Main, the Rhine, and the Hercynian Forest. No part of Bohemia is thus bounded.

Hence, I believe the *Boi-o-hem-um* of Tacitus to have been, not Bohemia, but *Bavaria; Bavaria* and *Bohemia* being nearly the same words.

a. The first element in each is the proper name *Boii.* In the sixth and seventh centuries the fuller form of Bavaria is *Bojo-aria, Bai-varia, Bajo-aria, Baiu-varii,* etc.

b. The second element is equivalent *in power*, though not *in form*, to the second element in *Bo-hemia.* It is the word *ware* = *inhabitants* or *occupants* in the Anglo-Saxon form, *Cantware* = *people of Kent.*

Hence *Bohemia* = the *Boian occupancy; Bavaria* = *the occupant Boians.*

This leads us to the fact that however much we may place the *Boii* in *Bo-hemia*, we cannot do so *exclusively.* As far as the name goes, there were *Boii* in Bavaria as well; Boii, too, who gave their name to their land.

I collect, from the numerous and valuable quotations of Zeuss, that—

1. The evidence of the present country of *Bavaria* being

called by a compound of *Boio* + *ware*, begins as early as the sixth century.

2. That the evidence of the present country of *Bohemia* being called by a compound of *Boio* + *heim* is no earlier than the eleventh.

I also collect from the same data, that, though the Bavarians of Bavaria are called *Boii* as late as the eleventh century, there is no conclusive instance of the *Bohemians* being so called.

In my edition of the Germania, I have made Boiohemum Bavaria to the exclusion of Bohemia. I would now modify this view. Some of Bohemia and some of Bavaria constituted the Boiohemum of antiquity. More than this, I think that the greater portion of it was Bavarian.

SECTION XXIV.

THE TEUTONES AND CIMBRI.

In the difficult and unsatisfactory investigation of the ethnology of these populations we find four names—(1), Ambrones; (2), Tigurini; (3), Teutones; (4), Cimbri. To each of these I shall give a separate Subsection, beginning with—

SUB-SECTION I.

THE AMBRONES.

The current accounts, as is well known, give two decisive battles to the skill of Marius—one won B.C. 102, at Aquæ Sextiæ in Provence; the other B.C. 101 near Vercellæ. In the former, the Teutones, Tigurini, and Ambrones are more particularly engaged; in the latter, the Cimbri.

Now it is only in the first of these battles that the Ambrones appear.

The notices of them, herein, are important; relating, as they mainly do, to the word as a gloss. Thus—

Plutarch writes that before the battle they advanced beating their arms, and crying "Ambrones! Ambrones!" At this the Ligurian portion of the Roman army echoed the word, it being their own ancient name—σφᾶς γὰρ αὑτοὺς οὕτως ὀνομάζουσι κατὰ γένος Λιγυες.—(*Vit. Marii*, 14).

Supposing the Ambrones to be a population of some portion of the Ligurian frontier, external to the districts reduced by, or in alliance with, Rome, this is highly probable. They are opposed to their own countrymen, much as the Ionians of Asia were, during the Persian war, opposed to the Greeks; or as, in later times, the Gauls of Roman Gallia might be opposed to the still unconquered tribes of the north. Under such conditions, what more natural than that they should parade their nationality in the way mentioned in the text, and that it should be the Ligurian portion of the opposing army that should, at least, understand them. Whether it was equally natural that it should be taken up in the manner described is another question.

Next—as a geographical term for some portion of the populations on the drainage of the Rhone, few names are more intrinsically probable than the one before us. As a geographical term, it may easily be the *-mbr-* in *Humber* and *Umbria*. Let the term have lost something of its original extent, and the fact of the text is the natural result. There was once a time when both the reduced Ligurians and their free conquerors were Ambrones. There was, then, a time when the southern tribes changed their denomination, or allowed it to become obsolete, the northern tribes retaining it. This is, as near as may be, the history of the word in England. At one time everything between the Humber and Tweed was North-*humbrian*. At present, it is only the northern portion of the original North-Humbria that retains its name. Imagine a battle in (say) the tenth century between the Scotch and the English, the Yorkshiremen being on the side of the latter, whilst Durham and Northumberland fought for Scotland, and something akin to what occurred in Provence might occur in one of our northern counties. The Scotch Northumbrians might scream out " Northumberland, Northumberland!" (with or without epithets or additions) to the now transmuted Yorkshiremen, who, whether they echoed it back or not, would still understand it, and, perhaps, recognise it as originally their own designation.

A further notice of the meaning of the word is found in Festus—"Ambrones fuerunt gens quædam Gallica quæ, qui subita inundatione maris cum amersissent sedes suas, rapinis et prædationibus se suosque alere cœperunt, ex quo tractum est ut turpis vitæ homines *Ambrones* dicerentur."

This extract is almost too confirmative of the text of Plutarch, as just interpreted. It confirms the view that *-mbr-* was a

geographical term. It confirms the view that it was the -*mbr*-
in Hu*mb*er (the river) and U*mb*ria (the country of waters). It
confirms the view that the drainage of the Rhone was the dis-
trict of the Ambrones, and, as it certainly was, of some of the
Ligurians.

Respecting, then, the Ambrones, who were conquered at
Aquæ Sextiæ by Marius, I hold that they were Gauls of the
frontier between Liguria and Helvetia, though not the only
Gauls so named. Wherever there were those relations of land
and water which the combination -*mbr*- expressed, there might
be *Ambrones*.

Further notices of the word may be found in Section YMBRE,
in my ethnological edition of the Germania of Tacitus.

SUB-SECTION II.

THE TIGURINI.

In like manner, the Tigurini were Helvetians of the pagus
Tigurinus.

SUB-SECTION III.

THE TEUTONES.

The illegitimacy of all arguments in favour of the Teutones
having been Germans, so often deduced from the name, has been
already indicated. In the present section it will be dealt with
more fully.

Germany is not the name by which a German denotes his own
country. He calls it *Deutschland*.

The German term *Deutsch* is an *adjective* ; the earlier form of
the word being *diutisc*. Here the -*isc* is the same as the -*ish* in
words like *self-ish*. *Diut*, on the other hand, means *people*, or
nation. Hence, *diut-isc* is to *diut*, as *popularis* is to *populus*.
This adjective was first applied to the *language* ; and served to
distinguish the *popular*, *national*, *native*, or *vulgar* tongue of the
populations to which it belonged from the Latin. It first appears
in documents of the ninth century :—" Ut quilibet episcopus
homilias apertè transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam

aut *theotiscam,* quo tandem cuncti possint intelligere quæ di-
cantur."—Synodus Turonensis, A.D. 813. "Quod in lingua
Thiudisca scaftlegi, id est armorum depositio, vocatur."—*Capit.*
Wormatiense. "De collectis quas *Theudisca* lingua heriszuph
appellat."—*Conventus Silvacensis.* "Si, *barbara,* quam *Teutiscam*
dicunt, lingua loqueretur.—Vita Adalhardi, etc."—D.G., i. p. 14,
Introduction.

As to the different forms in which either the root or the
adjective appears, the most important of them are as follows :—

1. In Mœso-Gothic, *piudiskó* = ἐθνικῶς—Galatians ii. 14 ; a
form which implies the substantive *piuda* = ἔθνος.

2. In Old High-German, *diot* = *populus,* gives the adjective
diutisc = *popul-aris.*

3. In Anglo Saxon we have þeód and þeódisc.

Sometimes this adjective means *heathen ;* in which case it
applies to religion, and is opposed to *Christian.*

Oftener it means *intelligible,* or *vernacular,* and applies to
language ; in which case it is opposed to *Latin.*

The particular Gothic dialect to which it was first applied
was the German of the Middle Rhine. Here the forms are
various :—*theodisca, thiudisca, theudisca, teudisca, teutisca.* When
we reach parts less in contact with the Latin language of Rome,
its use is rarer. Even the Germans of the Rhine frequently
use the equivalent term *Alemannic,* and *Francic ;* whilst the
Saxons and Scandinavians never seem to have recognised the
word at all.

Hence it is only the Germans of *Germany* that are *Theot-*
isci, or *Deut-sche.*

We of England, on the other hand, apply it only to the
Dut-ch of Holland.

Up to a certain time in its earlier history, the term *Dutch*
(*Teutisca, Theodisca, etc.*) is, to a certain degree, one of dis-
paragement ; meaning *non-Roman,* or *vulgar.* It soon, however,
changes its character ; and in an Old High-German gloss —
uncadiuti (*ungideuti*) = *un-dutch* is translated *barbarus.* The
standard has changed. Barbarism now means a departure from
what is Dutch. Nevertheless, originally *Deutsche* = *vulgar.*

Like *high* as opposed to *low, rich* to *poor,* etc., the word
Deut-sch was originally a *correlative* term—*i.e.* it denoted some-
thing which was *popular, vulgar, national, unlearned*—to some-
thing which was not.

What is the inference from all this? That the word *Teuton* = *Dutch* could have had no existence until the relations between the learned and lettered language of Rome, and the comparatively unlearned and unlettered *vulgar tongue* of the Franks and Alemanni had developed some notable points of contrast. *Deutsche*, as a name for Germans, in the sense in which it occurs in the *ninth* century, was an impossibility in the *first*, or *second*.

To continue the history of the word. About the tenth century the Latin writers upon German affairs began to use the words *Teutonicus* and *Teutonicé*. Upon this Grimm remarks that the latter term sounded more learned; since *Teutonicus* was a classical word, an adjective derived from the Gentile name of the Teutones conquered by Marius. I imagine that, as a general rule, this is what is meant from the beginning. Did the classical writers use it as equivalent to German? Some did—Velleius Paterculus most especially. Nevertheless, the usual meaning of the word *Teutones* in the classical writers is to denote a population identical with, or similar to, the *Teutones* conquered by Marius. In like manner the adjective *Teutonicus* meant *after the fashion of the Teutones.* I imagine that if a poet of the times in question were asked what he meant by the epithet, such would be his answer. That he would say that *Teutonicus* was only another word for *Germanicus*, and that the *Teutones* were *Germans*, I do *not* imagine, admitting, however, that a geographer or historian might do so. The classical meaning of *Teutones* and *Teutonici* is—*like the men whom Marius conquered*, whoever they were. Of course this term connoted something else. It was applied to the colour and texture of the hair; so that we read of *Teutonici capilli*. It was applied to the manner of throwing javelins, so that we hear of men who were—

> *Teutonico* ritu soliti torquere cateias.
>
> *Æneid,* lib. vii. 1. 741.

It was applied to several other characteristics besides.

This should be enough to lay the fallacy involved in the identification of the *Teut*-ones and *Deut*-sche. I doubt, however, whether it will do so; so wonderful is the vitality of an old error.

Let us say, however, that *Teut*-on and *Dutch*, the latter word retaining the power by which it originally came to denote the German language (viz., the power of *popular, vernacular, vulgar,*

etc.), are impossible connexions; and prepare for another view of the relation.

Though the *Teut-* in *Teut-*ones be not the *Teut-* in *Teut-*iscus in its secondary sense of *vulgar*, or *popular*, as opposed to *learned* and *cultivated*, it may still be the same word with its primary meaning of *people*. It is by no means unlikely for an invading nation to call themselves *the nation, the nations, the people*, etc. Neither, if a German tribe had done so, would the word employed be very unlike *Teuton-es*.

Again—we have the *Saltus Teut-o-bergius* mentioned by Tacitus (*Annal.* lib. i. p. 60). Whatever may be the power of the *Teut-* in *Teutones*, it is highly probable that here it means *people*, in other words, that it is the *Teut-* in *Dut-ch*, and that in its primary sense *populus*, rather than *vulgus*. It means either *the hill of the people*, or *the city of the people;* according as the syllable *-berg-* is derived from *báirgs = a hill*, or from *baúrgs = a city.*̇ In either case the compound is allowable, e. g. diot-*wëc*, *public way*, Old High-German; thiod-*scatho*, *robber of the people*, Old Saxon; þëód-*cyning*, þeod-*mearc, boundary of the nation*, Anglo-Saxon; þiód-*land*, þiód-*vëgr, people's way*, Icelandic.

Teut- then is, after all, a German gloss. Be it so. But what is the evidence of its being so, and meaning *people*, in the name of the Marian Teutones? None.

That *people*, however, was actually its meaning is only a probability at best.

But supposing that it were so, it would by no means follow that because it was a German word it was *exclusively* German. The root *p-lk* (*v-lg*) is equally Slavonic and Latin—*pulk = vulg*-us as well as the German *folk.*

What, then, does the gloss prove? Thus much. That, if we were sure it meant *people*, we should, *certainly*, have a German word, and, *probably*, a word exclusively German. But we are sure of nothing of the kind. As the matter stands, *Teut-* proves that the *Teut-*ones were *Deut-*sche just as the word *Pruss-*ian proves that the *Pers-*ians were Sarmatians; just as the word *Lithuan-*ian proves that the *Latin-*i were from the Baltic, just as a great many other words prove a deal of something else, *i.e.*, not at all.

Let the name, then, go for nothing in our enquiry, and, with this preliminary, let the few trust-worthy notices of the population conquered by Marius, and associated with the Cimbri, Tigurini, and Ambrones, be considered.

The Teutones belonged, as decidedly as the Ambrones, to the western field of operations—*i.e.*, the battle against them is fought in Provence, not in Lombardy. Appian is (I believe) the only author who gives them any share in the eastern movements.

The name associated with the Ambrones in Strabo is $T\omega v\gamma\acute{e}vo\iota$. This, however, has so generally been admitted to be neither more nor less than $T\epsilon v\tau\acute{o}vo\iota$, that we may be allowed to identify the two. If not, the Teutones must be considered as unnoticed by Strabo; Strabo's notice of them being that of Posidonius. It is to the effect that the Cimbri, after several previous invasions of other countries, at length invaded Helvetia, and associated with themselves the Tigurini, and Tôygeni ($T\omega v\gamma\acute{e}vo\iota$) which (by hypothesis) means Teutones.

I see no reason to refine on this statement, which makes them a Helvetian population. Helvetia is the country where they were most in contact with their allies, the Ambrones; the country whence a descent upon Provence would be eminently likely; the country whereof the geographical details (especially in the direction of Liguria) are so imperfectly described, as to make it an eminently probable area for such a population as the one under notice—a population of which we find no definite trace afterwards. (See TEUTONES AND TEUTONARII *in my edition of the Germania of Tacitus.—Epilegomena*, section 44.

I see, then, in the Teutones simply, certain otherwise obscurely-known neighbours of the Ambrones and Tigurini.

SUB-SECTION IV.

THE CIMBRI.

Of the Cimbri, I have investigated the extremely complex ethnology elsewhere; have repeated the investigation; and now return to it. Now, however, as before, I come to nothing but a negative conclusion. I think they were more likely to have been Kelts than Germans, and quite as likely to have been Slavonians as Kelts.

The doctrine which, in a contribution to the Transactions of the Philological Society, I propounded more than twelve years ago, is to the effect that the Romans of the times between the battle of Vercellæ and the conquest of Gaul, knew little about them in respect to their origin and relations; that when Gaul was conquered, and neither Teutones nor Cimbri had appeared,

either *iis nominibus*, or in any definite locality, speculation arose; that when Germany had been explored, and no Teutones or Cimbri been found, their area was transferred to the Cimbric Chersonese.

Speaking more generally, I maintained that when a given district, with which they had been previously connected, had been traversed and found wanting, the unknown parts immediately beyond it became the accredited starting-point. But these receded and receded till, at length, having begun with Gaul we end in Scandinavia.

Now this view arises out of the examination of the language of the historians and geographers as examined in order, from Sallust to Ptolemy and Plutarch.

Of Sallust and Cicero, the language points to Gaul as the home of the nation in question; and that without the least intimation of its being any particularly distant portion of that country. "Per idem tempus adversus Gallos ab ducibus nostris, Q. Cæpione et M. Manlio, male pugnatum—Marius consul absens factus, et ei decreta provincia Gallia."—Bell. Jugurth. 114. "Ipse ille Marius—influentes in Italiam Gallorum maximas copias repressit."—Cicero de Prov. Consul. 13.

Cæsar, whose evidence ought to be conclusive (inasmuch as he knew of Germany as well as of Gaul), fixes them to the south of the Marne and Seine. This we learn, not from the direct text, but from inference: "Gallos—a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit."—Bell. Gall. i. 1. "Belgas—solos esse qui, patrum nostrorum memoria, omni Gallia vexata, Teutones Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerint."—Bell. Gall. ii. 4. Now if the Teutones and Cimbri had moved from north to south, they would have clashed with the Belgæ first, and with the other Gauls afterwards. The converse, however, was the fact.

Diodorus Siculus, without defining their locality, deals throughout with the Cimbri as a Gaulish tribe. Besides this, he gives us one of the elements of the assumed indistinctness of ideas in regard to their origin, viz., their hypothetical connection with the Cimmerii. In this recognition of what might have been called the *Cimmerian theory,* he is followed by Strabo and Plutarch.—Diod. Sicul. v., 32. Strabo, vii. Plutarch, *Vit. Marii.*

The next writer who mentions them is Strabo. In con-

firmation of the view taken above, this author places the Cimbri on the northernmost limit of the area geographically known to him, viz., *beyond* Gaul, and *in* Germany, between the Rhine and the Elbe : Τῶν δὲ Γερμάνων, ὡς εἶπον, οἱ μὲν προσάρκτιοι παρηκοῦσι τῷ ᾿Ωκεανῷ. Γνωρίζονται δ᾿ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ ῾Ρήνου λάβοντες τὴν ἀρχὴν μέχρι τοῦ ῎Αλβιος. Τούτων δὲ εἰσὶ γνωριμώτατοι Σούγαμβροί τε καὶ Κίμβροι. Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ ῎Αλβιος τὰ πρὸς τῷ ᾿Ωκεανῷ παντάπασιν ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ἐστιν.—Lib. iv. Further proof that this was the frontier of the Roman world we get from the statement which soon follows, viz , that " thus much was known to the Romans from their successful wars, and that more would have been known had it not been for the injunction of Augustus forbidding his generals to cross the Elbe."—Lib. iv.

Velleius Paterculus agrees with his contemporary Strabo. He places them beyond the Rhine, and deals with them as Germans :—" Tum Cimbri et Teutoni transcendere Rhenum, multis mox nostris suisque cladibus nobiles."—ii. 8. " Effusa —immanis vis Germanarum gentium quibus nomen Cimbris ac Teutonis erat."—ii. 12.

Marmor Ancyranum. — " Cimbrique et charudes et semnones et eiusdem tractus alii germanorum populi per legatos amicitiam meam et populi romani petierunt."

Tacitus.—Eumdem Germaniæ sitem proximi Oceano Cimbri tenent, parva nunc civitas, sed gloriâ ingens : veterisque famæ latè vestigia manent, utrâque ripâ castra, ac spatia, quorum ambitu nunc quoque metiaris molem manusque gentis, et tam magni exercitûs fidem. Sexcentesimum et quadragesimum annum Urbs nostra agebat, cùm primùm Cimbrorum audita sunt arma, Cæcilio Metello ac Papirio Carbone consulibus. Ex quo si ad alterum Imperatoris Trajani consulatum computemus, ducenti ferme et decem anni colliguntur : tamdiu Germania vincitur. Medio tam longi ævi spatio, multa invicem damna. Non Samnis, non Pœni, non Hispaniæ, Galliæve, ne Parthi quidem sæpius admonuere : quippe regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas. Quid enim aliud nobis, quàm cædem Crassi, amisso et ipse Pacoro, infra Ventidium dejectus Oriens objecerit ? At Germani Carbone, et Cassio, et Scauro Aurelio, et Servilio Cæpione, Cn. quoque Manlio fusis vel captis, quinque simul consulares exercitus populo Romano, Varum, tresque cum eo legiones, etiam Cæsari abstule-

runt : nec impunè C. Marius in Italiâ, divus Julius in Galliâ, Drusus ac Nero et Germanicus in suis eos sedibus perculerunt. Mox ingentes C. Cæsaris minæ in ludibrium versæ. Inde otium, donec occasione discordiæ nostræ et civilium armorum, expugnatis legionum hibernis, etiam Gallias affectavere : ac rursus pulsi inde, proximis temporibus triumphati magis quàm victi sunt.

In respect to the *veteris famæ vestigia*, the disbeliever in the existence of either Cimbri or Teutones in Germany sees only an *inference*. Certain monuments required explanation. The Roman antiquaries referred them to the populations in question.

There is not a shadow of evidence that makes this belief native.

I think that the Marmor Ancyranum suggested portions of the preceding extract. The populations of the Marmor are the Cimbri, the Charudes, and the Semnones. Now, the order in Tacitus is nearly this. The Cherusci (probably the Charudes in the eye of Tacitus, who nowhere gives that name) are noticed just before, the Semnones just after, the Cimbri.

Ptolemy.—Now the author who most mentions in detail the tribes beyond the Elbe, is also the author who most pushes back the Cimbri towards the north. Coincident with his improved information as to the parts southward, he places them at the extremity of the area known to him : Καῦχοι οἱ μείζονες μέχρι τοῦ ᾿Αλβίος ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ αὔχενα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσό-νησον ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξονας, Σιγούλωνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν· εἶτα Σαβαλίγγιοι, εἶτα Κοβανδοί· ὑπὲρ οὓς Χάλοι· καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδούσιοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαροῦδες, πάντων δὲ ἀρκτικώτεροι Κίμβροι.

Pliny not only fixes the Cimbri in three places at once, but also (as far as we can find any meaning in his language) removes them so far northward as Norway : " Alterum genus Ingævones ; quorum pars Cimbri Teutoni, ac Chaucorum gentes. Proximi Rheno Istævones : quorum pars Cimbri mediterranei."—iv. 28. " Promontorium Cimbrorum excurrens in maria longe peninsulam efficit, quæ Cartris appellatur."—Ibid. 27. " Sevo Mons " (the mountain-chains of Norway) "immanem ad Cimbrorum usque pro-montorium efficit sinum, qui Codanus vocatur, refertus insulis, quarum clarissima Scandinavia est, incompertæ magnitudinis."—Ibid.

I conclude with Plutarch's notice : " They had no sooner

received the news that Jugurtha was taken, than reports were spread of an invasion from the Teutones and the Cimbri. And, though the account of the number and strength of their armies seemed at first incredible, it subsequently appeared short of the truth. For three hundred thousand well-armed warriors were upon the march; and the women and children, whom they brought along with them, were said to be still more numerous. This vast multitude were in search of lands on which they might subsist, and cities wherein to live and settle; as they had heard that the Celtæ before them had expelled the Tuscans, and possessed themselves of the best part of Italy. As for these, who now hovered like a cloud over Gaul and Italy, it was not known who they were, or whence they came, on account of their small commerce with the rest of the world, and the length of way which they had marched. It was conjectured, indeed, from the largeness of their stature, and the blueness of their eyes, as well as because the Germans called banditti Cimbri, that they were some of those German nations who dwell by the north sea.

"Some say the country of the Celtæ is of such immense extent, that it stretched from the Western Ocean and the most northern climes, to the lake Mæotis eastward, and to that part of Scythia which borders upon Pontus; that there the two nations mingle, and thence issue, not all at once, nor at all seasons, but in the spring of the year; that, by means of these annual supplies, they had gradually opened themselves a way over the chief part of the European continent; and that, though they are distinguished by different names, according to their tribes, yet their whole body is comprehended under the general appellation of Celto-Scythæ.

"Others assert that they were a small part of the Cimmerians, well known to the ancient Greeks; and that quitting their native soil, or having been expelled by the Scythians, on account of some sedition, they passed from the Palus Mæotis into Asia, under the conduct of Lygdamis their chief; but that the greater and more warlike part dwelt in the extremities of the earth, near the North Sea. These inhabit a country so dark and woody, that the sun is seldom seen, on account of the many high and spreading trees, which reach inward as far as the Hercynian forest. They are under that part of the heavens where the elevation of the pole is such, that, by the declination of the

parallels, it makes almost a vertical point to the inhabitants, and their day and night are of such a length, that they serve to divide the year into two equal parts, which gave occasion to Homer's fiction concerning the infernal regions.

"Hence, therefore, these barbarians, who came into Italy, first issued; being anciently called Cimmerii, and subsequently Cimbri, but not at all from any reference to their manners. Yet these things rest rather upon conjecture than upon historical certainty. Most historians, however, agree that their numbers, instead of being less, were rather greater than we have related.

"As to their courage, their spirit, and the force and vivacity with which they made an impression, we may compare them to a devouring flame. Nothing could resist their impetuosity; all that came in the way were trodden down, or driven before them like cattle. Many respectable armies and generals, employed by the Romans to guard the Transalpine Gaul, were shamefully routed; and the feeble resistance which they made to the first efforts of the barbarians was the chief thing which drew them toward Rome. For having beaten all they met, and loaded themselves with plunder, they determined to settle nowhere till they had destroyed Rome and laid waste the whole of Italy."

Such is the literary history of the name; a name implying an amount of ignorance on the part of our authorities which many will be unwilling to admit, and which some may say that no discreet critic should presume to impute.

Let us see how far this is the case. The ordinary doctrine is that the Cimbro-Teutonic wars were spread over a period of nearly twelve years: B C. 113, Papirius Carbo is defeated near Noreia in Noricum; and B.C. 101, the final slaughter of the Cimbri is effected by Marius and Catulus at Vercellæ. Between these two points the field of operations changes from Noricum to Helvetia, Gaul, Spain, and Cisalpine Italy.

The authorities of the different details of this series of battles and migrations are by no means of uniform value. The great and final battle of Vercellæ is, probably, known accurately and in detail—so far as it is known at all. Catulus, the colleague of Marius, wrote the memoirs of his own consulate; and Sylla, who was also in the battle, wrote *his* commentaries (Ὑπομνήματα). Let these stand as the authorities for the last great action of the Cimbri—the Cimbri as opposed to the

Teutones and Ambrones, who were annihilated elsewhere, and in the previous year.

There were, certainly, no memoirs of Catulus for the action at *Aquæ Sextiæ*; probably none of Sylla, who, we must remember, was a young man.

This throws us upon the general historians of the period—Q. C. Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias—writers who had, certainly, opportunities of knowing the details of all that was done by the Roman armies, either in or out of the presence of the enemy, as well as much of what was done by the enemy in presence of the Roman armies. In allowing them all due and reasonable accuracy on these points, it is not too much to hold that a great deal of what was effected between the several engagements, such as invasions of neutral countries, alliances, and the like, must have been most imperfectly understood.

That the original accounts, however, are lost, is well known. We have nothing, at first-hand, of either of the authors just named. Neither have we the books of Livy which treated of the years B.C. 113—101. We have the Epitome, and we have the copyists and compilers; but we have not Livy himself.

The nearest authorities are Strabo, representing Posidonius, and Plutarch. Of these, the former gives us nothing definite; the latter confesses his ignorance as to their origin.

Surely this justifies a considerable amount of doubt; the more so as the question is one of great importance.

Who the Cimbri, and who the Teutones were, are points which complicate numberless ethnological investigations. They complicate those of the Cambrian Welshmen; the Cumbrians of Cumberland, the Belgæ, the populations of Jutland or the Cimbric Chersonese, the Cimmerii, the Crim Tartars, the scriptural descendants of Gomer, etc. They complicate also the history of the Teutonarii, the Saltus Teutobergius, and the Dutch in general, by which is meant anything German, anything Gothic.

The names alone do this—Teutones on one side, Cimbri on the other.

The false inferences connected with the first have been noticed. The criticism concerning the second is as follows :—

1. It is, probably, a Gallic word, though it may be German. Plutarch writes that it is German, Festus that it is Gallic, for

robber. Granted, then, that it is Gallic (or German). What follows? Simply that certain Gauls or Germans called a certain population by a certain name,—a fact that fully proves that the Cimbri came in contact with Gauls and Germans, but nothing more. Evidence that the name is native, there is none.

2. In the matter of its medial consonants, Ci-*mbr*-i is the same word as A-*mbr*-ones. This, however, may be accidental. Be it so. There are, nevertheless, signs of either identity or confusion between the two. Have we not seen that *Ambrones*, if not exactly meaning *robbers*, meant something very like it? Have we not also seen that the Ambrones came from a district that had been flooded? So did the Cimbri. Strabo tell us this. He places them, however, in the parts between the mouth of the Rhine and the mouth of the Elbe.

3. With either of these meanings, "Cimbri" and "Ambrones" might be as common in either Gaul or Germany as "robbers" or "inundations."

Their alliance with the (probably) Keltic Teutones and Ambrones is *primâ facie* evidence of their being Gauls, but nothing more. A Kelto-Slavonic confederation is possible, and not improbable.

The utter ignorance of all the writers of antiquity respecting their origin, after all Gallia, and much of Germany had been explored, points to some of the more unknown areas; and these are generally Slavonic.

The German hypothesis, eminently untenable, rests on the wrong interpretation of the word Teutones, and the fact of the Cimbri being placed by Ptolemy, on the principle suggested above, in Jutland.

Say, then, that whilst the ignorance of antiquity is best accounted for by making them Slavonic, their alliance with the Ambrones, Tigurini, and Teutones favors the notion of their being Kelts,—favors it, but nothing more. As Slavonians, either *from* or *through* Noricum, they may have joined the alliance.

But is the evidence of the alliance itself unexceptionable? That the attacks were *concurrent* is certain. But is it so certain that they were conjoint?

The details as to the two populations having proceeded from some distant point together, and then having drawn lots concerning the countries that they are respectively to attack, are improbable.

Then come the *sequelæ* of the battle of Aquæ Sextiæ. In the first place, Marius is recalled to Rome, where he might have had a triumph if he chose. He defers it, however. He then moves to join Catulus; but waits for the army, which he sends for from Gaul, before he crosses the Po. He is now in front of the Cimbri. But they (the recital is from Plutarch) defer the " combat, pretending that they expected the Teutones, and wondered at their delay; either being really ignorant of their fate, or choosing to appear so, for they punished those who brought them an account of it with stripes, and sent to ask Marius for lands and cities, sufficient both for themselves and for their brethren. When Marius inquired of the ambassadors, ' Who their brethren were?' they told him, ' The Teutones.' The assembly burst into laughter, and Marius tauntingly replied, ' Don't trouble yourselves about your brethren, for they had land enough of our giving, and they shall have it for ever.' The ambassadors, perceiving the irony, scurrilously assured him, in reply, ' That the Cimbri would chastise him immediately, and the Teutones when they came up.' ' And they are not far off,' said Marius; ' it will be very unkind in you, therefore, to go away without saluting your brethren.' At the same time, he ordered the kings of the Teutones to be brought out, loaded as they were with chains; for they had been taken by the Sequani, as they were endeavouring to escape across the Alps."

Is this credible? First, Marius is recalled; then he travels to Rome, as rapidly as we please. There he makes speeches and the like. Thence, he marches to the Po.

Meanwhile (supposing the movements of the army to be simultaneous with those of Marius), but, *afterwards*, (if we maintain that he had a previous interview with Catulus,) the army moves from Aquæ Sextiæ to Vercellæ.

Is all this done with greater rapidity than the news of a defeat could pass from the Rhine to the Po? Did Marius reach Rome first, and the quarters of Catulus afterwards, in less time than the messengers from the Teutones reached the Cimbri? Did l.is army move over the same ground more quickly than those messengers?

Then, is the incredulity of the Cimbri probable? Were they members of an alliance sufficiently large to be formidable to Rome, and yet without communication with their allies? or was it part of their system to believe only what they chose? This is

mere child's play. According to hypothesis, the two divisions had been acting in unison for more than ten years, having ravaged Illyria, Gaul, and Spain. Was this an organization that could give such results as the conquests with which they are credited?

The account is Plutarch's; and it *may* have been taken from the commentaries of either Sylla or Catulus. It *may*, however, have been a mere floating anecdote.

This, however, is irrelevant to the main question, and is brought forward more with a view of showing how little we know about the populations in question. I *think* that the Cimbri were Slavonians. That they had as little to do with Cimbric Chersonese, as the Teutones had with the Dutch, I am sure.

SECTION XXV.

THE PICTS, *EO NOMINE*.

The meaning of the words *eo nomine* will be explained in the next chapter; the present being devoted to the question—Who were the Picts?

Some make them Kelts of the British branch.

Others make them Scandinavians.

Others make them something else; but these are the only hypotheses which command our notice.

The following facts, in favour of the former, are from a paper of Mr. Garnett's, in the Transactions of the Philological Society:—

1. When St. Columba, whose mother-tongue was the Irish Gaelic, preached to the Picts, he used an interpreter—*Adamnanus* apud *Colganum*, 1, 11, c. 32. This shows the *difference* between the Pict and Gaelic.

2. A manuscript in the Colbertine Library contains a list of Pict kings from the fifth century downwards. These names are not only more Keltic than Gothic, but more Welsh than Gaelic. *Taran = thunder* in Welsh. *Uvan* is the Welsh *Owen*. The first syllable in *Talorg* (= *forehead*) is the *tal* in *Talhaiarn*= *iron forehead*, *Taliessin = splendid forehead*, Welsh names. *Wrgust* is nearer to the Welsh *Gwrgust* than to the Irish *Fergus*. Finally, *Drust, Drostan, Wrad, Necton*, closely resemble the Welsh *Trwst*,

Trwstan, Gwriad, Nwython, whilst *Cineod,* and *Domhnall* (*Kenneth* and *Donnell*) are the only true Erse forms in the list. This shows the affinity between the Pict and Welsh.

3. The only Pict common name extant, is the well-known compound *pen val,* which is in the oldest MS. of Beda *peann fahel.* This means *caput valli,* and is the name for the eastern termination of the Vallum of Antoninus. Herein *pen* is un-equivocally Welsh, meaning *head.* It is an impossible form in Gaelic. *Fal,* on the other hand, is apparently Gaelic, the Welsh for a *rampart* being *gwall. Fal,* however, occurs in Welsh also, and means *inclosure.* "Incepit autem duorum ferme millium spatii à monasterio Æburcurnig ad occidentem, in loco qui sermone Pictorum *Peanfahel,* lingua autem Anglorum *Penneltun* appellatur; et tendens contra occidentem terminatur juxta Urbem Alcluith."—*Hist. Ecc.* i. 12. In an interpolation, apparently of the twelfth century, of the Durham MS. of Nennius, it is stated that the spot in question was called in Gaelic *Cenail.* Now Cenail is the modern name *Kinneil,* and it is also a Gaelic trans-lation of the Pict *pen val,* since *cean* is the Gaelic for *head,* and *fhail* for *rampart* or *wall.* If the older form were Gaelic, the substitution, or translation, would have been superfluous.

4. The name of the *Ochil Hills* in Perthshire is better explained from the Pict *uchel = high,* than from the Gaelic *uasal.*

5. Bryneich, the British form of the province of Bernicia, is better explained by the Welsh *byrn = ridge* (*hilly country*), than by any word in Gaelic. — *Garnett, in Transactions of Philological Society.*

All this is in favour of the Picts having been not only Kelts, but Kelts of the British branch. At the same time, it is any-thing but conclusive.

Claudian often mentions the Picts. That he mentions them in company with the Saxons is a point of no great importance. He mentions them, however, as the occupants of a northern locality—a locality, at least, as far north as the Orkneys.

> "Quid rigor æternus cœli; quid sidera prosunt
> Ignotumque fretum? maduerunt Saxone fuso
> Orcades; incaluit *Pictórum* sanguine *Thule,*
> Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne."
>
> · *De quart. Consul. Hon.* 30–34.

The northern locality indicated by this quotation points to-

wards Scandinavia. So do the local traditions of the Orkney and Shetland Islands, where the ruins of numerous ancient dwelling-places are called Pict Houses.

The next locality notable for traditions respecting the Picts is the Scottish border, or rather the line of the Roman wall; which is again attributed to the *Picts*.

So that we have the Picts' Wall in Cumberland and Northumberland, and the Picts' Houses in Orkney and Shetland; not to mention the Pentland (Pihtland) Firth, which is generally considered to be *fretum Pictorum*.

Again—the most Scandinavian parts of Scotland are Caithness, Orkney, and Shetland; also Pict.

Finally—the Danish termination -*by* occurs in Scotland nowhere between Dunscanby Head, on the *Pent*land Firth, and Annandale, in the parts about the *Picts*' Wall; where we have Locker*bie*, etc.

I submit that no doctrine respecting the Pict ethnology should pretermit these facts, however strong those of the opposite view may be.

Again—Nennius writes, "Post intervallum multorum annorum Picti venerunt et occupaverunt insulas quæ *Orcades* vocantur; et postea ex insulis affinitimis vastaverunt non modicas et multas regiones, *occupaveruntque eas in sinistrali plaga* Britanniæ; *et manent usque in hodiernum diem. Ibi tertiam partem Britanniæ tenuerunt et tenent usque nunc.*"—*Nenn.*, cv.

Again—"Ut Brittones a Scottis vastati Pictisque Romanorum auxilia quæsierint, qui secundo venientes, murum trans insulam fecerint; sed hoc confestim a præfatis hostibus interrupto, majore sint calamitate depressi.

" Exin Brittania in parte Brittonum, omni armato milite, militaribus copiis universis, tota floridæ juventutis alacritate spoliata, quæ tyrannorum temeritate abducta nusquam ultra domum rediit, prædæ tantum patuit, utpote omnis bellici usus prorsus ignara : denique subito duabus gentibus *transmarinis* vehementer sævis, Scottorum a Circio, *Pictorum ab Aquilone*, multos stupet gemitque per annos. Transmarinas autem dicimus has gentes, non quod extra Brittaniam essent positæ; sed quia a parte Brittonum erant remotæ, duobus sinibus maris interjacentibus, quorum unus ab Orientali mari, alter ab Occidentali, Brittaniæ terras longe lateque inrumpit, quamvis ad se invicem pertingere non possint. Orientalis habet in medio sui urbem

Giudi, Occidentalis supra se, hoc est, ad dexteram sui habet urbem Alcluith, quod lingua eorum significat ' petram cluith ; ' est enim juxta fluvium nominis illius.

" Et cum plurimam insulæ partem, incipientis ab austro, possedissent, contigit gentem Pictorum de *Scythia*, ut perhibent, longis navibus non multis oceanum ingressam, circumagente flatu ventorum, extra fines omnes Brittaniæ *Hiberniam* pervenisse, ejusque septentrionales oras intrasse, atque inventa ibi gente Scottorum, sibi quoque in partibus illius sedes petisse, nec impetrare potuisse. Ad hanc ergo usque pervenientes navigio Picti ut diximus, petierunt in ea sibi quoque sedes et habitationem donari. Respondebant Scotti, quia non ambos eos caperet insula : ' Sed possumus,' inquiunt, ' salubre vobis dare consilium quid agere valeatis. Novimus insulam aliam esse non procul a nostra, contra ortum solis, quam sæpe lucidioribus diebus de longe aspicere solemus. Hanc adire si vultis, habitabilem vobis facere valetis : vel si qui restiterit, nobis auxiliariis utimini.' Itaque patentes Brittaniam Picti, habitare per septentrionales insulæ partes coeperunt ; nam Austrina Brittones occupaverant. *Cumque uxores Picti non habentes peterent a Scottis*, ea solum conditione dare consenserunt, ut ubi res perveniret in dubium, *magis de feminea regum prosapia*, quam de masculina regem sibi eligerent : *quod usque hodie apud Pictos constat esse servatum.*"

In these extracts a *third* of Britain is given to the Picts. Now a *third* is the portion which is afterwards given to the Scandinavians.

The fact of the royal blood running in the *female* line invalidates the inference drawn from the British character of the names of the Pict kings.

But there is the evidence of the Pict glosses, which are British. But is it certain that they are Pict ?

Take a series of names from some of the more English parts of Wales ; *e. g.* the parts about Swansea. They will be Welsh, in respect to the country they come from, but they will not be from the language of the Welshmen.

May not this be the case here ? We must choose between a conflict of difficulties. The British hypothesis will not account for the Picts of Orkney, nor the Scandinavian for words like *Peanfahel.*

I conclude with the following extract from Beda :—" Procedente autem tempore, Britannia post Brittones et Pictos, tertiam

Scottorum nationem in Pictorum parte recepit, *qui* duce *Reuda* de Hibernia progressi, vel amicitia vel ferro sibimet inter eos sedes quas hactenus habent, vindicarunt : a quo videlicet duce usque hodie *Dalreudini* vocantur, nam lingua eorum *daal* partem significat."

But one view has been taken of the construction of this passage, viz., that *qui* refers to the word *Scottorum;* so that it was the *Scots* who came from Ireland, the *Scots* whom Reuda led, the *Scots* in whose language *daal* meant part. Nevertheless, the true antecedent *may* be the word *Pictorum.*

At any rate, we remember that *dal = pars* is *not* a Scotch, and *is* a Scandinavian word.

SECTION XXVI.

ON THE CRUITHNEACH.

The investigation of the ethnological relations of the Cruith-neach is part and parcel of the question concerning the position of the Picts.

It is generally, perhaps universally, stated that the name by which the Picts were known to the Irish was *Cruithneach,* or rather it should be said that the general or universal translation of the word *Cruithneach,* a word which appears frequently in the Irish Chronicles, is *Pict.* The fact, however, has never been proved. I may, indeed, say that it has never been investigated. What does it rest on in the way of external evidence ? Nothing. What in the way of internal ? That, word for word, *Cruithneach* is *Pict,* is what no one has pretended. Neither has any one maintained that the one term is a translation of the other. Pict, where it has been translated at all, has been connected with the Latin *pictus, painted. Cruithneach,* on the other hand, where *it* has been interpreted, has been made a derivative of the Greek word κριθον (*krithon*) = *barley.* Neither of these views is correct ; the latter being absurd. These are noticed, however, for the sake of shewing that the two names have never been looked upon as equivalents in the way of signification. If *Cruithneach,* then, mean *Pict,* it means it in the same way that *German* means *Dutch* : the words being different, and their meanings, so far as they have any, being different also. But

before it is stated that two words unconnected both in form and power mean the same thing, special evidence should be adduced; and this, in the case before us, has not been done.

It may be said, however, that the history of the Cruithneach is that of the Picts. This, however, is saying too much. All that can be stated with accuracy is that there is nothing incompatible between the two. What likelier place and time for a Pict invasion than Ireland in the sixth century?

But this is not enough. The following is an argument against the two words being identical. All the nations with which the Picts have ever been connected were known to the Irish under names other than Cruithneach. Were they Kelts? If so, the name, even in Ireland, would be Briton, or Scot, or Gael. Were they Scandinavians? If so, Llochlin was what the Irish would call them—Llochlin or Tuath-da-Danaim (*i.e.* Danes).

Let us take a purely formal view of the word. Suppose *Cruithneach* had been a name, *totidem literis*, of a nation in the north of Europe, occupant of a seacoast, and situated in a country from which Ireland could be invaded? What should we have made of the word then? There is, assuredly, something which we should *not* have done. We should not have made it mean *Pict*, however well the Pict history might have suited. On the contrary, we should have taken it as we found it, and simply said that, besides such and such invasions of Ireland, there was a Cruithneach one also. We might, indeed, if the identification of the Picts gave us trouble, make the Picts Cruithneach; but this would be very different from making the Cruithneach Picts.

We may put the case differently. We may take some nation actually existing, under conditions of time and place, that would give them the same position in the Irish annals that is given to the Cruithneach. We may indeed, write their name instead of Cruithneach, wherever that word appears. Let us do this; and let the name be Fin. Who will say that, if the Fins appeared instead of the Cruithneach throughout the pages of the Irish historians, he would refine upon the fact so patently suggested by the name, viz., that there was a Fin invasion of Ireland. All that he could say was that it was not exactly the invasion he expected—that Picts in their place would be the likelier population. This, and the like, he might say; but he would never deny a Fin invasion, simply on the strength of its com-

parative improbability. He would be satisfied with what the name suggested.

What we have hitherto only supposed, is now stated to be a real fact; not exactly one according to the strict terms of the previous hypotheses, but one closely approaching them.

No such name as *Cruithneach* is known in any part of Europe whence Ireland could be accessible—no such name, *totidem literis*.

Neither is any name exactly like it universally admitted to have prevailed in any part of Europe whence Ireland was accessible at the time of the Cruithneach invasions.

We have not the thing, then, exactly.

But we have a near approach to it. It is submitted :—

1. That the parts on the Lower Vistula are parts from which invasions of Ireland were practicable.

2. That the name for the population occupant of these parts in the eleventh century, is universally admitted to have been some form of the root *Pr-th;* and good reason can be given for the same designation having been current at the time of the Cruithneach.

3. *Pruth-* is not *Cruth-* exactly, *i.e. totidem literis*. But it is as nearly the same word as the absence of *p* in the Irish Gaelic will allow. *Cruth-* is the form that *Pruth-* would take in Irish Gaelic, where *c* replaces *p*.

Word for word, then, we may deal with Cruithneach as if it were actually Pruthneach; at any rate, it is the only form which the word could take in Gaelic.

SECTION XXVII.

THE LINGUA BRITANNIÆ PROPRIOR OF THE AMBER COAST.

For this, see Section ii., which is really an anticipation of the chapter which otherwise would appear here.

For the further notice of the Picts and Cruithneach, see the next section.

SECTION XXVIII.

Separating the *Picts* from the *Cruithneach*, we have found reasons in favour of the former having been Scandinavians, *i.e.* Norwegians, Swedes, or Danes.

Separating the *Cruithneach* from the *Pict*, we have found reasons in favour of them (the Cruithneach) having been Pruthneach, *i.e.* Pruthenians, or Prussians.

With the two populations thus isolated, the doctrine suggested by the latter inference is free from complications. It may, indeed, be erroneous. It is not, however, traversed by any real or apparent incompatibilities.

Is it equally uncomplicated if the current identification of the two stand good? I submit that it is so to a great extent. Prussians would come from the north; Scandinavians would do no more. Prussians might settle in the Pict localities just as easily as Danes. If a Prussian origin is impugned by the statements at the beginning of Section xxv., so is an origin from Norway. If the objections, however, are insufficient against the Norwegian, they are equally so against the Prussian, hypothesis.

On the other hand, however, it must be admitted that the forms in -*by*, and the gloss *daal*, are more Scandinavian than Prussian; though the latter is not a word on which much stress is laid.

The identity, then, of the Cruithneach with the Picts is compatible with a Scandinavian (Northern), incompatible with a Keltic, affinity for the latter.

I add to this remark the following. Supposing the Picts not to have been Kelts, there is a slight fact against their being Scandinavians in the term *Pent*land. It is Norse. But is it a term that one Norse, or Scandinavian population, in the limited sense of the word, would apply to another? I think not. When the Norwegians, Danes, or Swedes, spoke of Picts, they certainly meant something other than Swedish, Danish, or Norwegian.

Such, then, is the Prussian hypothesis—an hypothesis for which I only claim a share of the credit, in case it be true. I am at liberty to connect it with the name of my friend Professor Graves, who, on the strength of a wholly independent series of researches, not only identifies the Cruithneach of the Irish Chronicles with the Prussians, but also the Fomorians of the same with the Pomoranians. If this be the case (as I believe it is), the northern elements in Great Britain and Ireland are as follows :—(1) Scandinavian, = Danish, Norwegian, Swedish; (2) Sarmatian; *a.* Slavonic = Pomeranian; *b.* Lithuanic = Prussian.

I am inclined to add Fin, or Ugrian, elements as well. The exposition, however, of this doctrine forms no part of the present work.

CHAPTER I.

Preliminary survey of the forms of words and the permutations of letters.

SECTION I.

Introductory Remarks.

In order to display, in its real extent, the affinity which subsists between the Celtic dialects and other languages, it will be necessary to compare them in two different points of view, and to examine, in the first place, the relations between their respective vocabularies or stocks of primitive words or roots; and secondly, the peculiarities and coincidences in their grammatical structure. But before we enter into details which properly belong to either of these subjects, we must consider some general principles of inflection, which have an important influence on the structure of words and sentences in several of the languages to be examined.

SECTION II.

Of the permutation of letters in composition and construction—Of Sandhi and Samása in Sanskrit—Of the same principles as discovered in the Celtic dialects—in the Welsh—in the Erse—Of the digamma and sibilant in Greek.

It is a habit common to many of the Indo-European languages to interchange certain letters accord-

ing to rules founded originally on euphony, or on
the facility of utterance; and from this circum-
stance arises the great capability, which these lan-
guages possess, of composition, or the formation of
compound words. The substitution of consonants of
particular orders for their cognates, which takes
place in Greek in the composition of words, and
in some other instances, is an example of this pecu-
liarity.

In Greek, in Latin, and in the German dialects,
the mutation of consonants is confined to words
brought together under very peculiar circumstances,
as chiefly when they enter into the formation of
compound terms, and it is scarcely observed in
words which still remain distinct, and are merely
constituent parts of sentences. Either the attention
to euphony and the case of utterance has not ex-
tended so far, or the purpose was attained by a
choice of collocation, the words themselves remain-
ing unaltered. But in the Sanskrit language words
merely in sequence have an influence upon each
other in the change of terminations, and sometimes
of initial letters, on the principle above alluded to.
Thus, instead of *atishthat manujah*, stabat homo, the
man stood, we find the words written *atishthan ma-
nujah*, the final *t* of the verb *atishthat*, stabat, being
altered into *n* on account of the liquid consonant
with which the next word begins. This change in
distinct words is termed by the Sanskrit gramma-
rians संधि, Sandhi, conjunction; but the laws ac-

cording to which compound words are formed, and which have a similar reference to euphony, are designated समास, Samāsa, coalition. This last process is to be observed in most, if not in all the European languages, and the rules which govern it in all instances are very similar; but the alteration of consonants in entire words, according to the rules of Sandhi, have been considered as in a great measure peculiar to the Sanskrit. It is, however, a remarkable fact, that in the Celtic dialects, and more especially in the Welsh, permutations in many respects analogous to those of Sandhi are constant and indispensable in the formation of sentences. It is impossible to bring three or four words together in the Celtic languages, without modifications similar in their principle to those of Sandhi.

The general principle of these changes in Sanskrit may be understood by the following table of consonants, arranged according to the organs by means of which they are pronounced, and likewise according to the intensity and mode of utterance. The former arrangement is analogous in some respects to that of the Greek mutes, but more numerous and comprehensive. It consists of five classes, termed Guttural, Palatine, Lingual, Dental, and Labial. To these is added a sixth, consisting of semivowels; and a seventh, containing Sibilants and an Aspirate, which is associated with the Sibilants. The second division is into two orders termed Surds and Sonants.

	SURDS.			SONANTS.		
Gutturals	K	K'h	G	G'h		Ng.
Palatines	Ch	Ch'h	J	J'h		Gn.
Linguals	Ṭ	Ṭ'h	Ḍ	Ḍ'h		Ṇ.
Dentals	T	T'h	D	D'h		N.
Labials	P	P'h	B	B'h		M.
Semivowels			Y	R	L	V.
Sibilants	Ṣ Sh S H					

The vowels are included
among the Sonants.

The laws of Sandhi forbid the meeting of con-
sonants of different orders. Hence a surd conso-
nant at the end of a word is changed with the
corresponding sonant, if the next word begins with
a sonant ; and sonants are changed into surds if the
following words begin with surds.

Nearly of the same description are the muta-
tions of consonants in the Celtic language ; but in
order to obtain a view of the whole system of these
changes, it is necessary to compare several dialects,
as there is not one which preserves them all in an
entire state. The Welsh alphabet has them, how-
ever, in greater variety than the others. In this
all mute consonants of the order termed above
surds have four forms, and those which correspond
with the sonants have three. The semivowels or
liquids have two. The sibilant letter had probably
its mutation into the aspirate ; but this is lost in
Welsh, though preserved, as we shall see, in the
Erse.

First order, the primitive letters being surds.

	First form, Sharp.	Second form, Obtuse.	Third form, Aspirate.	Fourth form, Liquid.
Gutturals	c	g	ch	ngh
Dentals	t	d	th	nh
Labials	p	b	ph	mh

Second order, in which the primitives are sonants. These have two changes.

	Primitive.	Obtuse.	Liquid.
Gutturals	g	initial omitted	ng
Dentals	d	dh or Saxon þ	n
Labials	b	v	m

Third order, Liquids.　These have one change.

lh (corresponding with the surd lh or lr of the Vedas)	l
m	v
rh	r

OF THE MUTATIONS OF CONSONANTS IN THE ERSE OR GAELIC.

In the Erse dialect of the Celtic language the mutations of consonants are not so varied. Each consonant appears in two forms only, which are termed the plain and the aspirated. But the aspirated forms in the Erse are often the obtuse forms in Welsh, the aspiration being deceptive, and arising from the imperfect orthography adopted in this language. The addition of *h* to the primitive consonants serves only to render it obtrusive, or, in other instances, to obliterate it. On this account I

shall set down the table of consonants, with one column for the obtuse letters as usually spelled, and another indicating their pronunciation, which is in general similar to that of the obtuse forms in Welsh.

	Plain or primitive form.	Secondary form as spelled.	Secondary form as articulated.
Gutturals	C or K	Ch	X aspirate or Kh
	G hard	Gh	
Dentals	T	Th	H
	D	Dh	
Labials	P	Ph	F
	B	Bh	V
	M	Mh	V
	F	Fh or H	H
Liquids	L (like Welsh Lh)	L	L plain
	N	N̈	
	R (like Rh)	R̈	
Sibilants	S	Sh / Ṡ } or H	H

It is to be observed that H never stands as the initial of a word in Erse in the primitive form, or is never in fact an independent radical letter. It is merely a secondary form or representative of some other initial, viz. F or S. It must likewise be noticed, that the same words which begin with S or F as their primitive initial in the Erse, taking H in their secondary form, have in Welsh H as their primitive initial. This fact affords an instance exactly parallel to the substitution in Greek of the rough and soft breathings for the Æolic digamma, and, in other

words, for the sigma. Οἴνῳ, as it is well known, stands for ϝοίνῳ, Ἕσπερος for ϝέσπερος, and ἑπτὰ probably replaced a more ancient form of the same word, viz., σεπτὰ; ἑξ stands for σὲξ, ὗς and ἕρπω for σὖς and σέρπω. These instances might lead us to suppose, as Sir Edward Lhuyd has long ago observed, that the Greek language had originally a regular mutation of initial consonants, similar to that of the Celtic, though it was lost, except in these instances, or rather as pointed out by these vestiges, previously to the invention of letters.[11]

It is necessary to explain somewhat more fully the nature of these mutations of consonants in the Celtic language, and this can only be done by pointing out the circumstances under which they take place. The following examples are from the Welsh :—

I. Words of four initials.

GUTTURALS.

Câr, a kinsman.

    1 form, Câr agos, a near kinsman.
    2 form, Ei gâr, his kinsman.
    3 form, Ei châr, her kinsman.
    4 form, Vy nghâr, my kinsman.

DENTALS.

Tâd, a father.

    1 form, Tâd y plentyn, the child's father.
    2 form, Ei dâd, his father.
    3 form, Ei thâd, her father.
    4 form, Vy nhâd, my father.

Pen, a head.

    1 form, Pen gŵr, the head of a man.

    2 form, Ei ben, his head.

    3 form, Ei phen, her head.

    4 form, Vy mhen, my head.

II. Words of three initials.

Gwâs, a servant.

    1 form, Gwâs fydhlon, a faithful servant.

    2 form, Ei wâs, his servant.

    3 form, Vy ngwâs, my servant.

Duw, a god.

    1 form, Duw trugarog, a merciful god.

    2 form, Ei dhuw, his god.

    3 form, Vy nuw, my god.

Bara, bread.

    1 form, Bara cann, white bread.

    2 form, Ei vara, his bread.

    3 form, Vy mara, my bread.

III. Words of two initials, liquids and sibilants.

Lhaw, a hand.

    1 form, Lhaw wenn, a white hand.

    2 form, Ei law, his hand.

Mam, a mother.

    1 form, Mam dirion, a tender mother.

    2 form, Ei vam, his mother.

Rhwyd, a net.

    1 form, Rhwyd lawn, a full net.

    2 form, Ei rwyd, his net.

As the sibilant has no similar inflexion in Welsh, I must take an example from the Erse.

Súil,[a] an eye.

    1 form, Súil.

    2 form, a húil, his eye.

Sláinte, health.

    2 form, Do hláinte, your health.

          N.B. F has the same mutation.

Words beginning with vowels in Welsh are subject to changes similar to those belonging to the form Guna in Sanskrit. They also take the aspirate after words which cause the consonants to be aspirated.

In Welsh composition these changes in the initial consonants take place more frequently in reference to the sense of words and the rules of grammatical construction, and without any respect to the principle of euphony which governs the Sandhi in Sanskrit. But there are a great many similar changes in Welsh, for which no other reason can be assigned than some real or fancied advantage in respect to sound or the facility of utterance. It must likewise be observed, that in some instances

---

[a] In these instances the initial *s*, though converted into an aspirate in pronunciation, is sometimes retained in orthography, either with a dot over it, or followed by *h*. But in either case the sibilant is entirely lost. There seems to be no precise rule of orthography in this instance.

changes are induced in the terminating consonants of preceding words, as well as in the initials of succeeding ones.

In the influence which some of the numerals have on other words examples may be found tending to illustrate these remarks.

Un makes no change in the following noun ; as

un gwr, one man.

Tri and chwech change the initials into the corresponding aspirates ; as

tri châr, for tri câr.

chwech châr, or chwe châr.

Dêg, ten, before blynedh, years, changes not only the initial of the following word into its corresponding liquid, but likewise its own final consonant into the liquid analogous to it.   Thus, instead of

dêg blynedh,

we read

dêng mlynedh, ten years ;

and instead of

pump blynedh,

we find

pum mlynedh, five years.

In like manner, when the preposition yn is prefixed to a noun, it not only changes the initial of the following noun on the same principle of euphony, or ease of pronunciation, but is likewise itself changed. Thus, for

yn canol, we read yng nghanol,

yn pen   „   ym mhen,

yn tŷ, we read yn nhŷ,

yn bara   „   ym mara,

yn gŵr   „   yng ngŵr.

The changes above described are in a great measure analogous to those which have been pointed out as taking place in Sanskrit, except that the latter affect principally, though by no means exclusively, the terminations of words.

NOTE ON SECTION II.

(11). This doctrine is exceptionable. All that the examples of the text show is that the digamma of certain stages and dialects became lost or changed, and that the Greeks used *h* in certain cases where the Latins used *s*. The evidence that such forms as *hex*, *sex*, or *vex* ($F\epsilon\xi$), ever existed in the same dialect of the Greek languages at the same time is wholly inconclusive.

SECTION III.

Of the interchange of particular letters between different languages—
Table of numerals—Observations deduced from it.

There is another comparison of corresponding consonants and vowels, or of letters frequently and habitually interchanged, which it is necessary to take into consideration, before we can proceed with advantage in examining the analogies which exist between languages of the same stock. I refer to the phenomena which relate to the interchange of particular letters in the derivation of words from one dialect into another, or in deducing them into both from a common original, and to facts which prove

that these changes take place according to certain rules, and not by a merely accidental variation or corruption.

In order to ascertain the rules which govern this system of changes, it is necessary to proceed with great caution. The vague conjectures in which writers upon etymology have too frequently indulged, have brought ridicule and contempt upon the legitimate pursuits of the philologist, and upon the philosophical study of languages, and have induced some persons to entertain doubt, whether it is possible to deduce from this quarter any historical conclusions of importance, either as to the derivation of languages themselves, or of the tribes of people who are found to use them. As an introduction to what may be stated on this subject, I lay before my readers a comparison of the cardinal numbers in several Indo-European languages. It will be apparent on a very superficial glance, that the words expressing these numerals in all the dialects mentioned are derived from one origin, though variously modified; and a survey of these modifications will shew the particular changes which words and the elements of words assume in the respective languages.

SANSKRIT.	PERSIAN.	RUSSIAN.	LATIN.	ERSE.	WELSH.	GREEK.	MÆSO-GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERMAN.
एक eka	ک yak	odin'	unus, a, um	aen	un	εἷς, μία, ἓν	ains, aina, ain	ein
द्वि dwi / द्वौ dwau	در dū	dva / dvie	duo, duæ, i. e. duai	da / do	dau / dwy	δύο, δοιώ	twai, twos, twa	tue
त्रि tri	سه sih	tri	três, tria	tri	tri, tair	τρεῖς, i. e. τρέες, τρία	thrins	thri
चतुर् chatur	چهار chahār	chetyre	quatuor, petor, Oscan.	keathair	pedwar, pedair	πίσυρες, πέσσυρες, τέτορα	fidwor	fiuuar
पंच pancha	پنج panj	pyat	quinque	kuig	pump	πέμπε, πέντε	fimf	finfe
षष् shash	شش shash	shest'	sex	se	chwech	ἓξ	saihs	sehs
सप्तन् saptan	هفت haft	sem	septem	secht	saith	ἑπτά	sibun	sibun
अष्ट ashta	هشت hasht	osm, vosem	octo	ocht	wyth	ὀκτώ	ahtan	ohto
नवन् navan	نه nuh	devyat'	novem	noi	naw	ἐννέα	nihun	niguni
दशन् dasan	ده dah	desyat'	decem	deich	dêg	δέκα	taihun	tehan
विंशति vinsati	بیست bist	dvatzat'	viginti	fichid	ugain	εἴκοσι, q. e. Ϝείκοντι(?)	twaimtigum	tuentig
त्रिंशत् trinsat	سی sī	tritzat'	triginta	deich ar hichid	dêg ar ugain.	τριάκοντα	thrinstigum	thrittig
शत satam	سد sad	sto	centum	kett	cant	ἑκατόν	hund	hunt

A very slight inspection of these tables will be sufficient to convince any person that nearly all the words contained in them are derived by each language from some of its cognates, or by all from a common source. It is therefore allowable to make them a subject of examination, from which the peculiarities of each dialect may, so far as such a specimen can extend, be discovered.

It is easy to observe that certain consonants, or certain classes of consonants in one language, are almost uniformly substitutes for certain others in a different language; and although this observation can here be made only on a confined scale from so small a specimen of the vocabulary, it may be sufficient for furnishing suggestions which will be amply established from other materials.

One of the most striking facts that appears on comparing these lists of numerals is, that in some of the languages of western Europe guttural or hard palatine consonants abound, and take the place of the sibilants, soft palatines, and dentals, and even of the labial consonants, which are found in the more eastern and in some northern languages. Thus

श ṣ		c, *i.e.* k
स s		q
ष sh	are converted into	g
प p		ch. *i.e.* χ
π		κ.
τ		

The following examples prove this remark :—

NUMERAL 4.

chatur,	Sansk.				
chetyre,	Russ.	} ch			
chahār,	Pers.				
τέτταρες,	Gr.	} τ	become	{ quatuor,	Lat.
πίσυρες,		} π		{ k, keathair,	Erse
pedwar,	Welsh	} p			
petor,	Oscan.				
fidwor,	Goth.	} f			
fiuuar,	Teut.				

NUMERAL 5.

pancha,	Sansk.	p and ch			
panj,	Pers.	p and j			
πέντε,	Gr.	π and τ	become	{ q and q, quinque,	Lat.
πέμπε,	Gr.	π and π		{ k and g, kuig,	Erse
pump,	Welsh	p and p			
fimf,	Goth.	f and f			

NUMERAL 6.

shash,	Sans.	sh and sh			
shash,	Pers.	sh and sh	become	{ ch and ch guttural } chwech,	Welsh
sex,	Lat.	s and x		(ʻ) and ξ, ἐξ,	Greek
saihs,	Goth.	s and s			

NUMERAL 7.

saptan,	Sansk.	s and pt	become { s and cht,	Erse
septem,	Lat.	s and pt	h and ft,	Pers.
saith,	Welsh	s and th	(ʻ) and ππ,	Greek

NUMERAL 8.

			{ cht ocht,	Erse
ashtan,	Sansk.	sht	κτ ὀκτώ,	Greek
hasht,	Pers.	sht	become { ct octo,	Lat.
wyth,	Welsh	th	{ ht ahtan,	Goth.

NUMERAL 10.

daṣan, Sansk.	sh becomes	κ	δέκα,	Greek
		c	decem,	Lat.
		ch	deich,	Erse
		g	dêg,	Welsh
		h	tehan,	Teut.
		h	taihun,	Goth.

NUMERAL 20.

vinṣati, Sansk.	sh becomes	g	viginti,	Lat.
		g	ugain,	Welsh
		κ	εἴκοσι,[a]	Greek
		ch	fichid,	Erse

NUMERAL 30.

trinṣat, Sansk.	sh becomes	κ	τρίακοντα,	Greek
		g	triginta,	Lat.

NUMERAL 100.

ṣatam, Sansk.	sh become	κ	ἑκατὸν,	Greek
sad, Pers.	s	c	centum,	Lat.
		c	cant,	Welsh
		k	kett,	Erse
		h	hunt,	Goth.

The preceding facts suggest the following observations.

The Sanskrit and some other languages holding a near relation to it in the forms of words abound in sibilants and soft palatine consonants. They have these letters in several instances, in which cognate words in other languages have in the place of them gutturals, or hard palatines, or dentals.

---

[a] εἴκοσι was probably Ϝείκοντι.

The Greek substitutes for the sibilants and soft palatines of the Sanskrit, chiefly the *tenues* of the hard palatine or guttural class and of the dental, viz., κ and τ. In several instances the Greek, particularly the Æolic, has π in the place of the Sanskrit soft palatine, or च ch; as in πέμπε for pancha, πέσυρα (πέτυρα ?) for chatur.

The Welsh makes nearly the same substitutions as the Æolic Greek. It puts p for the soft palatine ch in the instances before mentioned. It substitutes more generally hard palatines or gutturals (either c, *i.e.* k), or ch for the soft palatines and sibilants of Sanskrit. It has the aspirate guttural ch instead of the aspirate sibilant sh. It has *th* in the place of ct and pt.

The Erse substitutes for the sibilants and soft palatines of the Sanskrit, gutturals, as the hard c or k, as also in some instances the guttural aspirate ch.

The Latin displays nearly the same phenomena as the Erse. It puts c or qu, equivalent to k, in the places of the letters above mentioned. Neither the Erse nor the Latin adopts the p of the Welsh and Æolic Greek, but they have c or q instead of it, as in other instances where the Sanskrit has ch च.

The Gothic and other Teutonic dialects resemble the Welsh and the Æolic Greek, except in the circumstance that they prefer aspirate consonants, as finfe for πέμπε or pump, fidwor for pedwar, or πέτυρ, thri for tri. They likewise substitute the simple h in the place of palatines and sibilants in other lan-

guages, as may be seen in a variety of instances, as in the numerals, 6, 8, 9, 10, 100. The Persic and the Greek languages use the aspirate in some instances in a similar manner.

We are not yet prepared for entering on a comparison of the vowels and diphthongs as they are related to each other in these cognate languages.

CHAPTER II.

Further proofs and extension of the observations laid down in the
preceding chapter.

SECTION I.

Introductory remarks.

THE changes which I have pointed out in the pre-
ceding section between particular consonants in the
derivation of words from one language to another,
appear, in some instances, so unlikely, and the
analogy, if any, in pronunciation is so remote, that
many of my readers may be disposed to regard the
examples on which I have founded my remarks as a
mere result of accidental coincidence. These changes
are, notwithstanding, regular and systematic. I
shall not attempt to account for them, or to say
how they took place, but they are accordant with
observations which may be traced to a great extent
in the comparison of kindred languages. As I can-
not, however, expect that any person should be
convinced of this fact on my assertion, I shall here
adduce some further evidence.

SECTION II.

Of the interchange of palatine or guttural consonants with labials in the different languages.

The interchange of cognate letters, both mutes and liquids,[a] is a thing familiar to every body, but the permutation of palatines into labials appears much more improbable. We have observed that this interchange has taken place in several instances in the numerals of Indo-European languages. Great as the difference is between such elements of articulation as k and p, we find them to stand as representatives for each other even in two different dialects of the same language. Some dialects of the Greek language afford a well-known exemplification of this remark. The Ionians and Æolians inserted κάππα in a variety of words, instead of πῖ, used in the other Grecian dialects. This remark has been made by many of the scholiasts and old grammarians, and more fully by Vossius,[b] who says, " Iones in interrogativis et relativis mutant π in κ. Ita κῶς dicunt pro πῶς; ὁκῶς pro ὁπῶς; κῆ pro πῆ; πόσος, κόσος; ὁπόσος, ὁκόσος; ποῖος, κοῖος; ὁποῖος, ὁκοῖος; πότε,

---

[a] The cognate mutes are

         t,   d,   th.
         k,   g,   ch.
         p,   b,   ph.

Cognate liquids or semivowels are in many languages the following:

         l,   r,   v.

[b] Gerard. Joh. Vossii de Litterarum permutatione Tractatus, Etymol. Ling. Lat. prefix., p. 24 : ed. *Neap.* 1762.

κότε ; ὁπότε, ὁκότε.   Græcis quoque κύαμος est faba.
Æoles quoque uti κ pro π testatur Etymologici
auctor in κοῖος.   Sic Latini jecur a Gr. ἧπαρ, et
scintilla, quasi spintilla, a σπινθήρ.''

The same writer has adduced other instances in
which this interchange has taken place between the
Greek and Latin.

Lupus.	λύκος.
Sepes.	σήκος.
Spolia.	σκῦλα.
Vespas.	σφηκάς.

'' Maxime tamen locum id habet in iis vocibus,
in quibus juxta Ionicæ et Æolicæ dialecti proprie-
tatem, π transiit in κ.

Equus ab Æolico ἵκκος pro ἵππος.
Inquio ab Æolico ἐννέκω ,, Gr. ἐννέπω.
Linguo ab Æolico λείκω ,, Gr. λείπω vel a λείπω,
λιμπάνω.

Quâ ab Ion.	κῆ pro Gr. πῆ.
Quatuor a	πέττορα, κέττορα.
Quinque a	πέντε, πέμπε, κένκε.
Quis a	τὶς, κίς.
Quoties ab Ionice	κότε, Gr. πότε.
Quotus a	κότος, pro πότος.
Sequor ab	ἕκομαι pro ἕπομαι.''[c]

The learned Edward Lhuyd has observed that a
similar interchange of p and k takes place regularly
between the Welsh and Erse dialects of the Celtic
language.   I shall cite his words and the evidence
he adduces for this remark.

[c] Voss., ubi sup., p. 24.

" It is very remarkable that there are scarce any words in the Irish, besides what are borrowed from the Latin, or some other language, that begin with p ; insomuch that in an ancient alphabetic vocabulary I have by me that letter is omitted ; and it is no less observable that a considerable number of those words, whose initial letter in the British language is a p, begin in the Irish with a k, or, as they constantly write it, with a c. This partly appears by the following examples :—

Paul, W.	a pole or stake,	Kûal, Ir.
Pêth,	{ a thing, part, share, some,	} Kod, Koda, Kûyd.
Pâ ?	what ?	Kâ ?
Pâsk,	Easter,	Kâsg.
Pencas, Corn.	Whitsuntide,	Kaikis.
Peiswin, W.	chaff,	Kaithsloan.
Pesuch,	a cough,	Kasachd.
Pen,	a head,	Keann.
Puy,	who ?	Kîa ?
Pûylh,	sense or meaning,	Kîal.
Plant,	children,	Klann and Kland.
Plŷv,	feathers,	Klûyv.
Peduar,	four,	Kathair.
Pymp,	five,	Kûig.
Pair,	a furnace or cauldron,	Kuir and Koire.
Pren,	a ton,	Kran
Pâr,	a couple,	Koraid.
Prîdh,	earth or clay,	Krîadh.
Pa raid,	wherefore,	K'red.
Prŷv,	a worm,	Krûv.
Pob,	every,	Ceach or Gach.

And sometimes in other parts of the words we find the same : as

Yspŷdhad,	a hawthorn,	Skîathach.
Mâp or Mâb,	a son,	Mak.

The preceding examples are quite sufficient to establish the fact asserted in the present section. We shall hereafter find the application of this remark.

SECTION III.

Of the interchange of sibilant and soft palatine consonants with gutturals or hard palatines.

It has been customary in many languages, and in our own among others, to soften the guttural or hard palatine letters, or to interchange them with other elements of pronunciation which are termed sibilants and soft palatines. We substitute the ordinary ch in the place of the hard c, or the k of other cognate languages, and say church for kirk or kirche. The Italians pronounce Tschitschero a name which the Greeks wrote Κικέρων. Secondly, many nations are in the habit of softening the g, and giving it the pronunciation of our j, as we are accustomed to do when this consonant comes before the vowels e and i. Thirdly, we shall find some languages converting the guttural aspirate χ or ch into sh, as the Welsh substitute chwech for the Sanskrit shash.

It will illustrate the two former of these changes

to observe that the Sanskrit च ch[d] is interchangeable in the regular inflexions of that language for क k, and ज j likewise for ग g. Thus, verbs beginning with k, in the reduplication of the initial, which in Sanskrit, as in Greek, is a character of the preterperfect tense, substitute ch for k, and verbs beginning with g substitute j for that consonant. The following are examples.

ROOT.	PRESENT.	PRETERPERFECT.
कृ kri, (to make)	करोति, karoti	चकार, chakára.
गै gai, (to sing)	गायति, gáyati	जगौ, jagau.

We cannot find a parallel fact in the Sanskrit language for the third remark, which respects the interchange of the aspirate sibilant for the aspirate guttural, because the Sanskrit has no consonant analogous to the Greek χî or the Welsh ch.

The preceding remarks will be more perspicuous if we place these changes in a tabular form, as follows :—

क k, or c, or q, interchanged for च ch.

,,   ,,   ,,   sometimes for श ṣ, ष sh, or स s.

ग g, ,,   ,,   ,,   ,, ज j.

χî as or chpirate guttural, for श ṣ, ष sh, or स s.

It must be observed that the Greek Ξî and Zῆτα are to be included in many instances among the palatine letters, and fall under the same rules of permutation. Ξî is sometimes represented in Sanskrit by क्ष ksh, but frequently by the simple cha-

---

[d] Ch, as in cherry.

racter corresponding with sh.   *Zῆτα*, when it is the characteristic of verbs making the future in ξω, may properly be considered as a palatine letter, and it will be found represented in Sanskrit by palatine consonants.

I shall exemplify these remarks by some lists of words in addition to those instances already discovered among the numerals, in which the abovementioned interchanges occur.   The first series contains examples of soft palatines in one language, and hard palatines or gutturals in another; the second, cases in which j is substituted for hard g, and the third, words in which sibilants appear in the place of gutturals or hard palatines.

I. Words in which च ch or ch soft is interchanged with hard palatine letters.

WORDS HAVING च CH OR CH SOFT.	WORDS HAVING HARD PALATINES.
च cha, and, subjoined to the noun,	καὶ (Gr.), que (Lat.)
chatur,	quatuor.
locha,	look (Eng.)
lochate, λεύσσει,	looketh.
lochayati,	lucet (Lat.)
lochanam (an eye)	lhygad, *i. e.* lhugad (W.)
vāchās,	voces (Lat.)
vachati, or vakti,	βάζει, *i.e.* βάκει, unde βάξις.
chyotati,	χεύεται, χέεται.
richch'hati (S.) reacheth (Eng.)	ὀρέγεται. erreicht (Germ.)

WORDS HAVING चु CH OR CH SOFT.	WORDS HAVING HARD PALATINES.
uchcha, and ⎱ high. uchchaih, ⎰	⎰ uch, uchel (W.) ⎱ hoch (Germ.)
uchchatā, (arrogance)	uchad (W.), act of rising.
church,	κυριακὴ, kirche, etc.

II. The following are examples of j or ज in Sanskrit supplying the place of γ or g in Greek and other European words.

SANSKRIT.	EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.
jānuh,	genu, γόνυ, knee.
jăni,	γυνὴ.
jăran,	γέρων.
jăratī,	γραῦς.
jarjati,	jurgat.
jāgaras,	ἐγρήγορος.
jātas,	begotten, γέτης.
tejayati, he sharpens.	θήγεται.
ajah,	αῖγα, goat.
rājăm,	regem.

III. Instances of sibilant consonants interchanged for gutturals.[e]

SIBILANTS.	GUTTURALS.
driṣ, root.	δέρκειν.
dădărṣă,	δέδορκα.
dans, root,	δάκνειν.
daṣati,	δάκνει.
miṣrayati,	μίσγεται.
miṣram,	mixtum,

[e] The words in the left hand columns not otherwise specified, and neither English, nor Latin or Greek, are Sanskrit.

SIBILANTS.		GUTTURALS.
aṣwah	⎫	⎧ equus.
asp (Persian)	⎭	⎩ each (Erse)
ṣwaṣuram,		socerum.
ṣwaṣrus,		socrus
paṣus,		pecus.
swasaram,		
sororem,		
schwester (Germ.)		⎰ khwāhar (Pers.)
suir (Erse)		⎱ khwäer (Welsh.)
sister,		
δρόσος,		druchd (Erse.)
seta (Lat.)		χαίτη.
		kesah (Sansk.)
suess (Germ.), sweet,		chwys (W.)
silex (Lat.)		χάλιξ.
schwan (Germ.), swan,		κύκνος.
short (Eng.)		curtus, court.
chien (French)		canis.
sus (Lat.) ⎱		⎰ khūk (Pers.)
ὗς (Gr.) ⎰		⎱ hwch (Welsh.)

SECTION IV.

Of the relations of the aspirate.—Of the substitution of the aspirate in several languages for S and for F.—Of the aspirate as a guttural or hard palatine.

The state of Greek words beginning with the aspirate, or with the digamma, has long been an object of attention among grammarians. Some of the facts connected with this subject are capable of

elucidation by a reference to the laws of the Celtic language.

It was observed by Edward Lhuyd, that H is never the first or proper initial of any word in the Erse language, but that words beginning with F or with S change that initial according to the laws of permutation peculiar to this dialect of the Celtic into H. Hence he infers with probability, that in the primitive form of these words they began with F or S, and that cognate words which begin with H in other languages have lost their proper initial. In like manner some Greek words now beginning with an aspirate have lost an original digamma, while others, as ἑπτὰ and ἐξ, corresponding with septem and sex in Latin, and with sapta and shash in Sanskrit, have in all probability lost an initial S.[a]

The following words, collected by Lhuyd, are cognate in the Welsh and Erse languages. In the Erse they begin with S in their primitive form, and with H in a secondary form, or *in regimine*. In Welsh they have only one beginning, with H. I add a third column to shew the correspondences presented by other languages, or merely to point out the meaning.

ERSE.	WELSH.	OTHER LANGUAGES.	MEANING.
saileôg or haileôg	helig	salix (L.)	willow.
salan or halan	halen	sal, ἅλς	salt.

[a] Lhuyd remarks with great probability, that such phenomena indicate the former existence of a system of permutation in other languages, similar to that which is still preserved in the Celtic dialects.

ERSE.	WELSH.	OTHER LANGUAGES.	MEANING.
sailte or hailte	hâlht	salitus	salted.
saith or haith	haid		swarm.
saith or haith	hûth		thrust.
sâv or hâv	hâv		summer.
savail or havail	havail	similis	like.
skoiltea	holht		cleft.
se	e		he.
seavak	hebog		hawk.
sealv	helva		herd.
sealva	helu		possession.
sealga	hela		hunting.
sealgaire	helliwr		huntsman.
sean	hên	senex	old.
seasg	hêsg	sedge and hedge.	
seile	haliu	saliva.	
seôl	hûyl	a sail.	
si	hi	sie, she.	
sin	hyn		this.
sîth	hedh, and hedhwch }		peace.
sîl	hîl		seed.
sîr	hîr		long.
soinean	hinon		fair weather.
sûan	hŷn	somnus, ὕπνος,	

Sometimes the H in Welsh is lost, as in

sêgh	ych	ox	
suas	yuch	super, ὑπέρ.	
silastar	elestyr		flag.

· It would be easy to point out numerous instances of a parallel description, in which words beginning in Greek with the aspirate have in Latin and other languages either S or the F—V.[b] The following are examples chiefly from Vossius :—

[b] Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik, p. 583.

1. Aspirate substituted for S.[c]

ὓς,	sus.
ἕρπω,	serpo.
ἃλς,	sal.
ἅλλομαι,	salis.
ἅγιος	sacer.
ἅρπω,	sarpo.
ἁλὶς,	satis.
ἒ,	se.
ἑκὰς,	secus.
ἕδος,	sedes.
ἥμισυ,	semis.
ἕπεσθαι,	sequi.
εἱρμὸς,	sermo. Scaliger.
ἑρπύλλον,	{ serpyllum. Servius in Eclog. 2.
ἕξις,	sexus. Festus.
ὁμαλὸς,	similis.
ἵστω, ἵστημι,	sisto.
ἑκυρὸς,	socer.
ἑκυρὰ,	socrus.
ὅλος, ὅλον,	solus.
ὕπαρ,	sopor.
ὕραξ,	sorex.
ἱδρὼς, and ἵδωρ,	sudor.
οὗ,	sui.
ὁλκὸς,	sulcus.
ὑπὸ	sub.
ὑπὲρ,	super.
ἑπτὰ	septem.
ἐξ,	sex.

[c] Lacones, Argivi, Pamphylii et Eretrienses Σ eximere solent atque aspirationem ejus loco sufficere; ita μοῦσα iis est μῶα: μουσικὴ, μωϊκά; πᾶσα, πᾶα; βουσόα, βουοά: ποιῆσαι, ποιῆαι, etc. Voss. vid. Prisc. L. V. Lhuyd, p. 30.

ὑπέρβιος,	superbus.
ὕπτιος,	supinus.
ἑὸς,	suus.
ὕλη,	sylva.

2. Instances of the rough aspirate substituted for F or V.[d]

ἑσπέρα,	vespera
εἴλω,	volvo.
Ἐνετὸς,	Venetus.
Ἐλία,	{ Velia. Serv. ad Æneid. 1. 359.
ἑστιᾶν,	festum.
ὁμιλία,	familia.
ἁρμοῖ,	ferme. Scaliger.
ἔρμα and εἱρμὸς,	firmus.

In other instances the Greek language seems even to have lost the spiritus asper, and pronounces such words with the gentle aspiration [e], as in the following:

ἄλδος, Dorice, pro ἄλσος,	saltus.
ἔπω,	sequo, dico.
εἰ,	si.
ἄνευ,	sine.
ἀνέω, ἀνῶ,	sino.
ἀριστερὸς,	sinister.
ὀρφέω, v. ῥοφέω,	sorbeo.

In these instances the spiritus lenis stands, where probably the spiritus asper once stood, for an ori-

ginal S. In the following, the digamma was ori-
ginally the initial letter:

ἔαρ,	ver.
ἴδμεν,	⎰ videmus, Sansk. vidmus, ⎱ scimus.
ἀλώπηξ,	vulpes.
ἰταλὸς,	vitulus.

Perhaps we may trace the effect of a similar dis-
position to soften and obliterate the initial S in the
following words beginning with consonants.

γλάφω,	scalpo.
γράφω,	scribo.
γλύφω,	sculpo.

H representing a hard palatine or guttural conso-
nant in the Teutonic languages.

In the foregoing paragraph it has been shewn,
that the rough aspirate or H represents in several
of the Indo-European languages, a sibilant, or the
digamma or vau. Thus the Welsh, as well as the
Greek language, drops the S or the F entirely, and
substitutes the aspirate in words which originally
had either S or F for their initial, or which appear
to have had one of them, as far as can be judged
from the cognate languages : while in the Erse the
aspirate is still used as a regular inflexion of words
properly beginning, and yet often retaining the ori-
ginal S or F. I shall now shew, that in the Latin
as well as in the Teutonic languages, H is the sub-

stitute for, or is to be considered as, a radical hard palatine or guttural.   It stands for k, g, or ch.

In the following words H in Latin seems to be a substitute for the Greek X.[f]

hiems,	χεῖμος.
halo,	χαλῶ.
hara,	χοῖρος.
heri, olim hesi,	χεσὶ, unde χθὲς.
hio, hisco,	χάω, χάσκω.
hir,	χεὶρ.
hirundo,	χελιδὼν.
hortus,	χόρτος.
humi,	χαμαὶ.
humilis,	χαμαλὸς.
humor,	χυμὸς.
veho,	ϝοχῶ.

In the following instances the Teutonic languages substitute H for a palatine in Greek and Latin words.[g]

claudus,	halts, halz, halt, (lame.)
κάνναβις,	hanpr, hanaf, hemp.
caput,	haubith, houbith, haupt.
καρδία, cor.	haerto, herza, heart.
κυὼν, canis.	hunths, hund, hound.
κοῖλος,	hol, hole, hollow.
celare,	hilan, hëln.
κάλαμος, calamus,	halam, halm.
κάρτος, καρτερὸς,	hardus, hart.
cornu,	haúrn, horn.
collum,	hals.

[f] G. I. Vossius, ubi supra.
[g] The list is taken from Dr. Jacob Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik.   The Teutonic words are Mœso-Gothic, Old High German, and English.

κρυμὸς,	hrîm, rhyme (old Norse.)
κλαίειν,	hlahan (Goth.)
κράζειν,	Lrakjan (Goth.)
κλέπτης,	hleftus (Goth.)
lux, (*i.e.* luks,)	liuhad, light, licht.
οἶκος,	veihs (Goth.), house.
tacere,	thahan, dagen.
socer,	svaihra (Goth.)

In Sanskrit we often find ह *h* corresponding to the Γ in Greek words.

măha,	μέγα.
ahan, or ĕhon,	ἐγών.

SECTION V.

Of the interchange of dental and sibilant letters.

In a variety of languages, either for the sake of euphony, or from caprice or accident, sibilant letters have been interchanged with dentals. The conversion of the Greek sigma into tau is familiar to all classical readers. The use of the double ττ instead of the double σσ is said to have been introduced in Athens by Pericles, but it probably pre-existed as a custom somewhere, otherwise it would have been too great an innovation. It was probably a Bœotian habit, for the Bœotians said συρίττειν instead of συρίζειν, or the Æolian συρίσσειν; and ὁπλίττω for ὁπλίζω. The interchange of σσ and ζ for ττ is a well known dialectic variety in the Greek language.

13

The single τ was also put for σ by the Æolians and
Dorians, as

φατὶ,		φασὶ.
δίδωτι,	for	δίδωσι.
ἔπετον,		ἔπεσον,
ποτειδᾶν,		ποσειδῶν.

The late Attics adopted this custom, and said
τήμερον, μέταυλος, for σήμερον, μέσαυλος.[a]

In the Teutonic languages the frequent use of s
and z in the one class, and of t by the other, has
always been a characteristic distinction of the idioms
which belong to the High and Upper German divi-
sion, and of those allied to the Platt Deutsch or
Lower German dialects. For water in English and
Holland-Dutch and Platt-Deutsch, the High-Dutch
has wasser; for aut, aus; for sweat, schweiss; for
foot, fuss; for sweet, süss; for let, läss. This fact
is so well known, that it is superfluous to dwell
upon it.

SECTION VI.

Of the substitution of R for S.

The interchange of s and r is very frequent in
many Indo-European languages.

Among the Greeks it is said that the Lacedæmo-
nians substituted ρ for σ, and probably other Do-
rians had the same custom. For ἵππος, πούς, θεὸς,
παῖς, they said ἵππορ, πὸρ, σίορ, πόϊρ.[b] The interchange

---

[a] Matthiæ's Grammar, ed. 1829, p. 34.
[b] Ibid. p. 33.

of ρσ for ρρ was much more frequent ; it is, at least, more commonly seen in books, ρσ being peculiar to the Attic dialect.

We learn from Quintilian, Varro, and Festus, that the Romans substituted r in a great many words for s, which had been more anciently used. According to the last mentioned writer the ancients wrote majosibus, meliosibus, lasibus, fesiis, for majoribus, melioribus, laribus, and feriis.

It has been observed, that r is the most recent form in all these instances, and s the most ancient.[c] In the very oldest specimen of Latinity that is extant, and which has been ascribed to the age of Romulus, viz. a hymn of the Fratres Arvales, engraved on a stone which was discovered A.D. 218, are found these words, "Enos Lases juvate," meaning, in all probability, "Nos Lares juvate." [d] It is said, indeed, that the letter r was unknown to the older Latins, who used s instead of it, till the time of Appius Claudius Cæcus, who introduced the r.

The following are examples of the substitution of r for s, in which we can trace both forms in the Latin language :

assus,	arsus.
robur,	robus, unde robustus.
honor,	honos.
arbor,	arbos.

[c] Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik.   Bopp's Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache.

[d] Lanzi, Saggio di Ling. Etrusca : t. i., p. 142.   Adelung's Mithridates, th. ii., p. 460.

pignora,	pignosa. ⎫
plurima,	plusima. ⎬ Festus.
holera,	helesa. ⎭
ara,	asa.
arena,	asena. Varro.
carmen,	casmen.
feriæ,	fesiæ. ⎫
lares,	lases. ⎬ Varro.[e]
erit,	esit.
Aurelii,	Auselii.
Furii,	Fusii. Quintilian.
Papirii,	Papisii.
Valerii,	Valesii. ⎫
labor,	labos. ⎬
clamor,	clamos. ⎬ Quintilian.
vapor,	vapos. ⎭

The same change may be inferred to have taken place in all words which take r in the increment instead of s; as, acus, pecus, fœdus, pignus.

The Latins substituted r for s in other words cognate with the Greek: as

celer	for	κέλης.
cruor	,,	κρύος.

The importance of this observation will hereafter be apparent, when we come to trace the relationship of Latin words with those of other languages. We shall find r frequently substituted in the former for an s or some equivalent in the Latin, and the resemblance is more decided between such words when

---

* Vossius, ubi sup.

we restore the original s. Thus sororem, perhaps originally sosorem, is almost identified with the Sanskrit swasaram. The same change of letters has an useful application to the inflections of verbs, as we shall have occasion to observe.

SECTION VII.

Of the relation of different vowels and diphthongs to each other in different languages.—Synoptical table of letters interchangeable between different languages.

The vowels are by no means to be discarded in tracing the derivations of words and the relations of languages, as some learned philologists have erroneously maintained. If any proof is necessary of this remark, a very striking and sufficient one may be found in Dr. Jacob Grimm's analysis of the Teutonic verbs.

The first letter of the Sanskrit alphabet, अ, or the a-kára, which we generally represent by a, is a short vowel, and, as it has been already observed by Professor Bopp, corresponds in different instances with nearly all the short vowels of the Greek and Latin languages. It is easy to point out many examples in which it occupies the place of the short ĕ and of the Greek epsilon, and the short ŏ and omicron, as,

daṣan (S.)   δέκα, decem.
ashta (S.)   ὀκτώ, octo.

It corresponds also very frequently with the Latin u before s or m in the terminations of words. The endings of Sanskrit adjectives and nouns are frequently in (अ:) or (अस्) for the masculine, (आ) for the feminine, and (अं or अम्) for the neuter: these are most correctly represented by ah or as or os, ā, and am or cv.

Instances may be found in which अ corresponds with other short vowels, but they are not so frequent; as

ăgnis,   ignis, fire.

The Sanskrit आ or long ā is most frequently found to occupy the place of ō or ω in Latin and Greek words; as in

dădāmi,   διδώμι.

The other Sanskrit vowels, i and u, long and short, correspond with those nearly related to them in sounds; viz. the long and short i or ἰῶτα, and the long and short u or ὐψιλὸν.

OF DIPHTHONGS.

The semivowels य ya, and व va, or wa, and the diphthongs ए e, and ऎ ai, correspond with the Greek and Latin vowels; thus,

य ya, and ए e,   with αι Gr. and ē Lat.
व wa, „ ए ai, „ ω and ō.

Examples of the former kind occur in the ter-

minations of verbs in the middle and passive voices in Sanskrit and Greek.   They are thus :

IN SANSKRIT.	IN GREEK.
e,	μαι.
se,	αι and σαι.
te,	ται.

य ya is used in Sanskrit where αι occurs in Greek and ē in Latin, in very many cases.   One example occurs in the form of verbs having in Sanskrit a future signification, but used in Greek and Latin with a preterite potential sense.   Thus, from the root Bhū or Fuo, we have

Bhavishyāmi—fuissem ⎫ related to ⎧ σαιμι.
——yasi   ——es   ⎬ the Greek ⎨ αις.
——yati   ——et   ⎭ form in   ⎩ αι.

व vă or wĭ.	वा vā or wā.
swānam (S.)	sonum (L.)
swăsaram,	socerum.
vācham,	vocem.
văkshate,	αὔξεται.
swasaram,	sororem

I shall conclude the foregoing remarks on substitutions or interchanges of letters in different languages by an attempt at a table of correspondences.

SANSKRIT.	PERSIAN.	RUSSIAN.	GREEK.	LATIN.	WELSH.	ERSE.	TEUTONIC.
प p	پ p	П p	π	c, qu / p, in the Oscan.	p	k or c	f
भ bh / ध dh	ب b / د d	B	φ, β / θ	f	b∝v	b∝bh	f
च ch	۰ kh / ح ch	Ч ch	τ	c, qu	p	k or c	f
id.			σσ, ττ	c	g		th
id.			ξ, ζ	x	g		k
ज j	ج j	Ж j	γ	g	g		
श sh / id.	س s / ش sh / ه h / ه h	С s / Ш sh	κ, χ / ξ / κ, χ	c / s∝r / s, c / v, f / s, c / v, f	g / ch, guttural / h / h / gw or w	ch / s∝h / f∝h / s∝h / f∝h	h / sch, S / s / h / h
ष sh / id.			(˙) ol. F / (˙) ol. σ / (˙) ol. F				
स s							

CHAPTER III.

Proofs of common origin in the vocabulary of the Celtic and other Indo-European languages.

SECTION I.

Names of persons and relations.

It is now time to examine how far the Celtic and other Indo-European languages are related to each other in their vocabularies, or by the possession of a considerable number of common roots or primitive words. From the comparison to be instituted for this purpose, it is obviously requisite to exclude all such words as from their nature appear likely to have been introduced at a late period by foreign commerce, by conquest, or with the adoption of a new religion or system of manners. I must confine my observations to the original materials of speech, and to expressions which denote simple and primitive ideas.

On entering on this part of my inquiry, I shall take some of the groups of words collected in the Amara Cosha, or Sanskrit Vocabulary of Amara Sinha, and try whether the corresponding terms in the Celtic dialects have any resemblance to them.[a]

[a] I do not confine myself to the particular vocables given in the Cosha, when other genuine words can be found which are more to my purpose, nor do I think it necessary to follow the exact order of arrangement observed by the author of that vocabulary.

In general, I shall place the Sanskrit words first, and then the Celtic, subjoining any terms which appear to be of cognate origin in the other European languages.

Words denoting persons and family or other relations.[b]

जनि   JANI (a woman).
Celtic,   GEAN, Erse. (Lhuyd.)
Russian,   Jena ; Gr. Γύνη ; Pers. Zen, Zenne.
वामा   Vāmā (a woman). (Am. Cosh.)
Celtic,   FEM, Erse. (Lh.)
वामनी   vāmanī (a woman).
Celtic,   femen, Erse. (Lh.)
Latin,   fœmina.
वनिता   vanitā (a woman).
Celtic,   Bean and Bhean or vean, Erse ; benw and
           benyw, Welsh. In regimen venw and
           venyw.
Greek,   Bήva et Báva, Bœotice vel Dorice, est mu-
           lier vel filia (Salmasius, p. 402, de Hel-
           lenistica) Βανῆτες, (Bœot. pro γυναῖκες,)
           mulieres.
वीरः   vīrah, a hero, warrior ; vir.
Celtic,   FEAR, Erse ; man.
           Gŵr and WR, Welsh, man ; pl. GWYR and
           WYR ; viri.
           Hence, gwraig and wraig, a woman. Com-

pare WR and WRAIG with VIR and VI-
RAGO or virgo.

N.B. Frag, Erse for gwraig; Germ. frau. Com-
pare the Greek Ϝήρως, heros, with FEAR.

नरः	narah, man, also *Lord*, applied to the Deity.
Celtic,	Nêr, lord.
Greek,	ἀνήρ.

There are three words in the Amara Cosha
corresponding with the word *father*. These are
तात, जनतः and पिता. One of these, janakah, is
derived from a root allied to the etymon of genitor
in Latin, which will be compared with its cognates
hereafter. The other two may be traced as follows:

तातः	tātăh, plural tātāh.
Celtic,	tâd, plur. tâdau, Welsh; tât, Ar-moric; tâz, Corn.; taid, a grand-father, Welsh.
Cognates :	ata, Mœso-Goth.; aita, Cantab.
पितृ	pĭtri, nom. pitā, acc. pitărăm.
Cognates :	Persian, padar.
Gr. and Lat.	πατήρ, πατέρα, pater, patrem.
Teut. dial.	vater, fæder, father.
Celtic,	athair,[c] Erse.
मातृ	mātri, nom. mātā, acc. mātaram.
Persian,	mādar ; Russian, mater.

That the word athair is really of cognate origin with pater, and other
European words of the same stock, appears probable from a comparison of the
following :—

athair	pater	pitri (S).
mathair	mater	matri (S).
brathair	frater	bhratri (S).

Celtic,   mathair, Erse.

Gr. and Lat. μητὴρ, mater.

Teutonic,   meder, mutter, mother, etc.

भ्रातृ   bhrātri, nom. भ्राता, bhrātā.

     The nearest cognates are—

Russian,   brāt'.

Celtic,   brawd (Welsh, in plur. brodyr ; com-
                pare the Sanskrit plural bhrātarah).

Persian,   brādar.

Teutonic,   brothar, (Goth.) bruder, brother, etc.

Celtic,   brathair, Erse.

Latin,   frater.   Compare φράτωρ.

स्वसृ   swasri, a noun of the same form, making
          in the accusative swasaram, sororem.

     This word has two sets of cognates ; one, in
which the sibilants are preserved as such ; the other
in which they are converted into gutturals, accord-
ing to the mode of permutation illustrated in
chap. ii., sect. iii.

Latin,   soror, acc. sororem, probably sosor, soso-
          rem in an older form,[d] is nearly allied
          to swasăram.

     Some languages alter the middle s by adding t ;
as—

Russian, sestra ; Teutonic dialects, suistar (Mœso-
          Gothic), schwester, sister.

     Others change s for h, and finally omit it, as—

Celtic,   Siur, Erse.

---

[d] Chap. ii., sect. vi.

Persic,   Khwāhar.

Celtic,   Chwaer (*i.e.* khwaher), Welsh; chuâr,
           Armor.; hor, huyr, Corn.

The Greek has no similar word.

दुहितृ   duhitri, nom. duhitā, acc. duhitărăm
           (daughter).

Greek,   θυγάτηρ, θυγάτερα.

Pers.   dukhtar; Goth. dauhtar; Germ. tochter.

Celtic,   Dear (dehar ?), Erse.

The Latin has no cognate word.

श्वशुर: swăsurah, a father-in-law; accus. swasu-
           ram.

Latin,   socer, socerum.

Russian, svekor'; Goth. svaihra; Germ. schwæher.

Celtic,   (converting sibilants as usual into guttu-
           rals) Chwegrwn, Welsh; Huigeren, Corn.

श्वश्रु:   swasruh or swasrus, a mother-in-law.

Latin,   socrus.

Celtic,   Chwegyr, pl. chwegrau, Welsh; hueger,
           Corn.

नप्तृ   naptri, a grandson, and naptrī, a grand-
           daughter.

Latin,   nepos and neptis, meaning also in a later
           sense, nephew and niece.

Celtic,   Nai, Welsh; noi, Corn.; ni, Arm. for
           nephew; and Nith, Welsh; noith,
           Corn.; nises, Arm. for niece.

           N.B. pt is mutable into th in Welsh, according to
           an observation in chap. i., sect. ii.

देवृ   devri, a brother-in-law, or husband's or wife's brother.

This word has no analogue, as far as I know, in any of the Celtic or Teutonic dialects.

Greek,   δαήρ ; Russian, diever' ; Latin, levir.

वंश: vanṣah, offspring.

Persic,   bachah (a child), pl. bachagān.

Celtic,   bachgen, Welsh.

The preceding words are the principal part of those by which family relations and the distinctions of persons are signified in the Indo-European languages. The greater part of them appear evidently to exist in the Celtic dialects under a peculiar form, which is the guarantee of their genuineness. That the Celtic words are really cognates of the Persian, Russian, Greek, Latin, German, and Sanskrit words no doubt can be entertained.

SECTION II.

Names of the principal elements of nature, and of the visible objects of the universe.[a]

Light, Flame.

ज्वाला Jwālā, also Jwalah.

Celtic, Gwawl, goleu, Welsh ; golou, Arm.

The Sun.

हेलि:   helih, or helis.

[a] Amara Cosha, book i., sect. i. and ii.

Celtic, Haul, pronounced haïl, Welsh; houl, heul, Corn.; heol, Arm.

Greek, ʿAέλιος, *i.e.* haëlios ; ˝Eλη, solar heat.

Note. The spiritus asper being changed for S in conformity with an observation in sect. iv. of chap. ii. we have Saul for haul. Compare sol, Lat.; in Russ. solustĕ.

Another Sanskrit word for sun is सूनुः sūnuh. Comp. Sunno, M. Goth. and Germ. sonne, sun.

The Moon.

क्लेदाः kledā ; also kledu.

Celtic, lheuad, or lhhyad (pronounce nearly as chleuad), Welsh. Also

ग्लौः glauh, which by Sandhi becomes

ग्लौर् glaur.

Celtic, lhoer (chloer), Welsh; loar, Arm.; lâr, Corn. Compare luan, Erse, with luna, Russ. and luna, Latin.

Star.

तारा tārā.

Greek, τείρεον; Welsh, seren; (pl. τείρεα, Welsh sêr and syr.) Armoric. steren.; Germ. stern. Goth. stairno; Pers. sitārah ; Latin, stella (perhaps a diminutive form of stera, as tenella from tenera). Compare also ἄστερα, and astra.

नभः nabhah, sky, atmosphere, æther, heaven.

Celtic, Nêv. Welsh and Corn.; neav, Erse. Russ. nebo.

नभाः nabhāh, a cloud, rain: nabholaya, smoke

Celtic, Nivwl (mist, cloud,) Welsh; Neal, Erse.
Germ.   nebel; Gr. νεφέλη, νέφας; Lat. nebula, nubes.
उदम्   udam, water; whence उन्द unda, to wet
            or moisten.
Russ.   voda, water; Pol. woda.
Latin,   udus, uda, udum, and unda.
Goth.   wato; A.S. wæter, water.   Compare wet,
            weather.
Greek, ὕδωρ, i.e. ϝυδωρ, or vudor.
Celtic, dwvyr, pl. duvrau.
द्यु   dyu. (a day.)
Celtic, Di and dia, Erse; dydh, Welsh
Latin,   dies.
Goth.   dags; A.S. dæg, day.
निशा   nǐsā. night.
Celtic, Nôs, Welsh.   Notch', Russian.
More remote are the following:
Nochd, Erse; nahts, Goth.; nacht, night, Germ.;
            νύξ, nox.
मीर: mīrah, ocean, sea.
Celtic, Môr, Welsh; muir, Erse; More, Russian;
            meer, mere, Germ. D.; mare, Lat.
धरा   dharā, earth.
Celtic. Daiar, Welsh. (in regim. dhaiar.)
    There is another Welsh word, tir. Compare
    terra, Lat.; airtha, Goth.; talamh-and tellur,
    Erse, with tellurem, Lat.
आश्र   āshtra, ether, air.
Celtic, athair, Erse.
Greek, αἰθήρ—αἴθρια, ἀηρ.

Celtic,   awyr, Welsh ; aer, Lat.
अग्नि:   agnih (fire.)
Latin,   Ignis ; Welsh, tân, *i.e.* taan.
Mœso-Goth. fon.
द्रु:   druh (a tree) ; dirakht, Pers. ;
Δρῦς,   Gr.; Derw, Welsh; dair, Erse (an
              oak tree.)

SECTION III.

Names of animals.

Of the terms for different species of animals, it appears that few, comparatively, are common to the Sanskrit and the European languages. Nor is this circumstance difficult of explanation : emigrating tribes, in seeking a new climate, and leaving behind them a great part of the stock of animals for which they had previously names, are obviously under the necessity of inventing other significant appellations for those peculiar to their new country. In this respect the Celtic dialects are under the same circumstances as the other European languages; and it may be clearly shewn that they partake of a common stock of terms with these languages; for though the European idioms differ from the Sanskrit, they have a common stock of such terms among themselves. There are, however, some instances of agreement with the Sanskrit, and this remark includes nearly all the domestic animals. In all the following instances the Celtic terms are cognate with those

belonging to the other European languages, and in some they bear a remarkable resemblance to the Sanskrit.

The interchange of sibilant with guttural consonants is here to be observed, as in the instances before cited.   Refer to numbers 1, 2, and 3.

Dog.

    Sanskrit, Sunah and shuni; shunī, bitch.

    Celtic,   Ki, pl. cŵn, Welsh; chana, Erse.

    Greek,   κύων, pl. κύνες; Lat. canis; Goth. hunths, hound.

Hog and Sow.

    Sanskrit, Sūkarah (hog);   Pers. khūk (hog or sow.)

    Celtic,   Hwch, Welsh (sow.)

    Greek,   ʽΥς; Lat. sus.

Horse.

    Sanskrit, aswah.

    Latin,   (changing sibilants into gutturals) equus.

    Greek,   ἵππος, Æol. ἵκκος (?)

    Celtic,   Each, Erse; asp, Pers.   Also,

    Greek,   Καβάλλης; Lat. caballus.

    Celtic,   keffyl, Welsh; caual, Arm.; capul, Erse. Also, Pers. faras; Germ. ross; Eng. horse.

Ass.

    Greek,   ὄνος; Lat. asinus.

    Celtic,   Asyn, Welsh, asal, Erse.

Goat.

    Sanskrit, ajah and chhaga ; Gr. αἴγα.

Latin,   caper.

Celtic,   gavar, Welsh; gobhar, Erse.

Ram.

    Sanskrit, Uraṇah.

    Celtic,   Hwrdh, Welsh ; urdh, Arm.; hor and
               hordh, Corn.

    Latin,   aries.

Oxen.

    Sanskrit. Ukshan, ox or bull.

    Celtic,   Ych, Welsh; agh, Erse; ochs, Ger. Also,

    Greek,   βοῦς ; Lat. bos, boves.

    Celtic,   Buw, Welsh ; bo, Erse.   Also,

    Latin,   bucula ; Welsh, buwch.

Bull.

    Greek,   ταῦρος ; Lat. taurus.

    Celtic,   tarw, Welsh; tarbh, Erse. (Compare Tōr,
               Chaldee.)

Cow.

    Sanskrit, Go ; Germ. kuh, cow.

Fish.

    Greek,   ἰχθὺς (olim Ϝιχθὺς ?)

    Latin,   piscis.

    Celtic,   Pŷsg, Welsh ; jasg, Erse.

    Germ.   fisch, fish.

Swan.

    Latin,   olor.

    Celtic,   alarch, Welsh ; eala, Erse.

Pigeon.

    Latin,   columba ; golub', Russian.

Celtic,　　colommen, Welsh; cwlm, Arm.; colm,
　　　　　　　columan, Erse.

Frog.
　　Latin,　　rana.
　　Celtic,　　kranag, Corn.; ran, Arm.

Fawn.
　　Greek,　　ἔλαφος.
　　Latin,　　hinnulus.
　　Celtic,　　elain, Welsh.

Lamb.
　　Greek,　　ἀρνὸς; Latin, agnus.
　　Celtic,　　oen, W.; ôan, Corn. and Arm.; an, Erse.

Crane.
　　Greek,　　γέρανος; Germ. krannich; Eng. heron.
　　Celtic,　　Garan, W.; and krŷr, Erse, korr.

Cuckow.
　　Greek,　　κόκκυξ, Lat. cuculus.
　　Celtic,　　Côg, W.; chuach, Erse.

PARAG. 2.

The following list of terms, chiefly for inanimate objects, display nearly the same degree of affinity as the preceding.

WELSH.	ERSE.	GREEK.	OTHER LANGUAGES.
derw	dair	δρῦς	druh, Sansk. (a tree)
faw, fawydh	faidhbhile	φηγὸς	fagus, beech
colhen, côlh		κόρυλος	cornel tree
lhyren and lhyriaid		λείριον	lilium, lily
lhêch	leac, liag	λίθος	

WELSH.	ERSE.	GREEK.	OTHER LANGUAGES.
lhaeth	laith	γάλακτα	lac, lactis
aradyr		ἄροτρον	aratrum
cwŷr	ceir or keir		cera
braich		βραχίων	brachium
lhwch	loch		lacus
lhu and lhuaws		λαὸς	lludi, Russ.
kentar (a nail) (Lh.)		κέντρον	
enw	ainm	ὄνομα	nomen nāman, S.
lhûg		aloka, Sansk.	lux
mêdh (mead)		μέθυ (wine)	
mel	mil	μέλι	mel
melin	meile	μύλος	mola
dant		ὀδόντα	dent-em dantah (Sans.)
awr	uair	ὥρα	hora
aur	or		aurum
corn		κέρας	cornu
coron	choroin		corona
cybhigl	chuvachail		cubiculum
rhyn (point)	sron	ῥὶν	
ysgraff scâff, Arm.	sgaffa	σκάφη	scapha
wr, wŷr	fear		vir, viri
wraig	frag		virago
gwrach		γραῦς	
gwîn, wîn	fin	ϝοῖνος	vinum
arriant	airgidh	ἀργύριον	argentum
tervyn	teor	τέρμα	terminus
einion	ineoin	ἄκμων	incus
pen	cean	κεφαλὴ	caput

WELSH.	ERSE.	GREEK.	OTHER LANGUAGES.
colovn	colbh		columnus
swn	soin	τόνος	sonus
byw	bio	βίος	vita
halen	salen	ἅλς	sal
cader	chathair	καθέδρα	chair (Eng.)
sowdwl	sael	κέλη	{ calcaneus heel. (Eng.)
croen	croiccionn	χρὼς	
erw		ἄρουρα	arvum
dôr (W. and Armor.)	} dorus	θύρα	{ thur (Germ.) dwara (Sansk.)
parth	pairt		parte
creuan		κάρηνον	
mynydh			{ monte mountain
fynnon			fonte
avon	amhain		amne
tir	tir		terra
	talamh		tellus
môr	muir		{ mare, meer (Germ.)
cylha		κοιλία	
cylch		κίρκος	{ circulus, circus
deigryn		δάκρυον	lachryma
eigion		ὠκεανὸν	oceanum
hedhwch, pl. hedhychau peace, quiet	}	ἡσυχία	
hwyliau			velæ
meidr		μέτρον	
gwŷr and wŷr	}		{ verum and veritas

WELSH.	ERSE.	GREEK.	OTHER LANGUAGES.
cariad		χάρις	caritas
cawr, a giant		γαῦρος	{ ghorah (Sans). { horrible.
	righ, a king		{ rájá (Sansk.) { regem (Lat.)

SECTION IV.

Verbal roots traced in the Celtic and other Indo-European languages.

जन्, Jan, a verbal root, whence the verbs जजन्ति, JAJANTI, gignit, and JAYATE meaning γίγνεται, gignitur, he is born; middle voice, jajána, γέγονα. Hence the following nouns in Sanskrit:

  Janah, a man.
  Janí, a mother.
  Janih, birth.
  Janitr, a father.
  Janimā, birth, procreation.

In Greek, γεννάω, γίνομαι, γέννημα, γένος, κ. τ. λ.

  Latin, gigno, genus, genero, genitor, etc.

  Celtic,

  1. Welsh, GENI, to be born.
      génedig, brought forth, or born.
      genedigaeth, birth, nativity.
      geneth, a girl.
      genid, birth.
      genilh, progeny.

2. Erse,   GEIN, offspring.
> geinim, to beget.
> geinéighim, to bring forth, and
> geintear, gignitur.

मृ MRI, a verbal root, whence the verb MRIYATE, moritur, and the causal verb mārayāmi ; MRITAH, mortuus : MARAH, mors.

The Greek language wants this word, unless the termination μόρος be derivable from it, though attributed to another verb.

Latin, mori, mortuus, etc.

Celtic,

1. Welsh, MARW, to die.
> marw, and marwawl, adj. dead, and deadly.
2. Erse,   marbh, *i.e.* marv, dead.
> meath, death; and meatham, to die.
> Compare Heb. מֵת, mēth, dead.

Sclavonic, Russian.
> umirat', to die ; umertii, dead.
> mor', mortality.

जीव् Jív, a root whence the verb
> JĪVĀMI, I live, or JĪVATI, vivit.
> jīva, life (Am. Kosh.)

In Latin, vivo, vita.

Greek, βίος, βίοω.

Celtic,

1. Welsh, BYW, or VYW, verb, to live.
> byw, adj. vivus
> bywyd, vita.

        bywâu, to vivify.

        BEUA (in Cornish), to live. Lhuyd.

2. Erse,   BEO, to live.

        BEATHA, life, vita.

चा Jnā, a verbal root, whence the verb jānāmi, I know; jānāti, he knoweth; jnātah, jnātā, jnātam, adj. notus, nota, notum.

Greek,   γνόω, and γνώμι, γινώσκω, γνώμη, κ.τ.λ.

Latin,   nosco, *i.e.* gnoo, gnotus, etc.

Ger. etc., kennen, know, etc.

Welsh, Gẁn, I know.

विद् Vid, a verbal root, whence the verb VEDA, (οἶδα,) in a preterite form, with a present signification, I know, he knows; veditum, to know; also

        vidwān, wise.

        vidwattā, veda, wisdom.

Greek,   εἰδέω, ἴδω, οἶδα. ol. ϝειδέω, or Vειδέω.

Latin,   video.

Teutonic,

    vide, to know; vidende, knowledge, Danish.

    weise, wissen, German.

    wit, wot, wise, English.

Celtic,

1. Welsh, gwŷdh and wŷdh, knowledge.

        gwydhad and wydhad, to learn.

        gwydhai, gwydhawl, wise.

        gwybod (irreg. verb), whence.

        gwydhost and wydhost, knowest.

2. Erse,   fis, or fios, knowledge. (Lh.)

        fisc,   a   seer ;   fiosaighim,   to know.

Here the roots are vid, S.; ἰδ or ειδ; vid. Lat.; vid, wit, Teutonic ; wydh, or gwydh, Welsh.

बुध Budh, a root, whence the verb BODHATI, he knows or understands.

        budhah, a sage.

Celtic,

    Erse,   FODH, knowledge.

        fodhach, wise.

श्रु Sru, a verbal root signifying to *hear*.

        Infinitive mood. SROTUM.

        SRUTAH, heard, adj. and part.

In Sclavonic, changing *l* for *r*.

        Russian, SLUCH, hearing.

        SLUTAT,' to hear.

In Greek, sibilants changed to gutturals (ch. 2. sec. 3.)

        κλύω, to hear.

        κλύτος, adj.

    In Celtic,

        Welsh, CLYW, hearing.

        clust, an ear.

        Erse,   cluinam, I hear.

        CLU, hearing, fame.

        cluas, an ear.

        CLOTHA, he heard.—Lh.

Here the roots in all the above languages are shru, slu, κλυ, clu.

लोच् loch, a verbal root, to which are referred the two following verbs:

 1. lochate, he sees; whence
   lochan, an eye.
  Greek, λεύσσει, he looketh.
  English, looketh.
  Celtic, lhygad (W.), an eye.
 2. lochayati, lucet.
  Latin, lux, luceo.
  Teutonic, licht, light, etc.
  Celtic, Welsh,
    lhwg, light; lhuched, lightning.
    lhewychu, to light.
    lhygu, to brighten, etc.

दृश् Dris, a verbal root, signifying
  to see.
 Pret. dadarsa, I saw.
 Greek, δέρκω.
   δέδορκα
 Celtic, Erse,
   DEARC, a verbal root, signifying sight,
    seeing, also an eye.
   dearcam, to see.
   dearcadh, seeing, sight.
   Welsh,
   drem, sight, etc.

Here the roots are dris, or rather dars, δερκ, and Celtic, dearc.

लिह् lih, a verbal root, signifying to lick.

1. person, proper form LIHE, lingor.
    Greek, λείχω.
    Latin, lingo.
    Goth. laigwan; A. S. liccan.
    Eng. lick.
    Celtic, Welsh.
          lhyaw, lhyvu, to lick.
          llyviàd, licking.
     Erse, lighim.
          do leigh se, he licked.

ष्ठा shṭhā, in inflection स्था, sthā, a verbal root,
whence the verb TISHṬHATI, he stands.
        tishṭhámi, I stand.
  Greek, ἴσταμι or ἴστημι, i.e. σίσταμι, and the ob-
          solete στάω.
  Latin, sto, stare, status, sisto, etc.
  Teut. standan (Goth.), stehen, stay, stand.
  Celtic, Erse,
        STA,   stand.
        stadam,   to stand.
        do stad se,   he stood.
  Welsh, eistedh,   to sit.
        eistydh,   sitting.

ऋछ् richh, a verbal root, whence the verb RICH-
        CHHATI, he moves towards, reacheth, Rich-
        chhámi.
  Greek, ὀρέγεται, ὄρεξις.
  Latin, porrigit.

Teut.   rakyan, (Goth.) reichen, erreicht, (Germ).
            reacheth, (Eng.)

Celtic, RIGH, a root in Erse ; whence righim, I
            reach ; richeadh, to stretch, reach, etc.

अस् as, a verbal root, whence the verb substantive,
          ASMI, ASI, ASTI, sum, es, est ; SYĀM, sim,
          or siem.

Pers.   AST, he is ; hastan, to be.

Greek,   εἰμὶ, (ol. ἐσμὶ,) ἐσσὶ, ἐστί.

Latin,   esum, es, est.

Teut.   ist, is, etc.

Celtic,   YS (passive form) and ydis.
          OES, he is, Welsh.

Erse,   IS, as is me, is tu, i se, I am, thou art,
          he is.

N.B. This root is defective in all the above languages, and a great part of the forms of the verb substantive are supplied from the following.

मू bhū, a verbal root, whence the verb BHAVAMI,
    I am ; pret. babhūva, fui ; babhūvima, fuimus.

Pers.   BŪDAN, to be ; BŪD, he was ; existence,
          being.
          BŪ, be thou.

Latin,   fuo, fui, fuvimus.

Teut.   beon, to be, A. Sax. bin, bist, be, etc.

Sclav.   buit', to be, Russ.

Greek,   φύω, φύμι, φύναι.

Celtic,   BŪM, BUOST, BU, Welsh ; fui, fuisti, fuit.
          bŷdh, erit ; bôd, esse.

Erse, BU mi, I was ; BHITH, to be.

N.B. Compare Byd, the world, from the same root, with Būd in Persian, and Bhūh, the world, in Sanskrit.

अन् an, a verbal root, whence the verb *anyate*, respirat, vivit, and *animi*, respiro. The first person of anyate was perhaps, as the analogy of the other persons, and of the active voice would suggest, originally *anyāme*, instead of *anye :* whence

Latin, animus, anima, animatus.

Greek, ἄνεμος.

Celtic, anaim (Erse), soul, spirit.

तन् tan, a verbal root, whence the verb *tanoti*, he extends, stretches.

Greek, τείνω, τανύω, τάνυμαι.

Latin, tendo.

Celtic, TAEN, spreading, extension.

taenu, to spread, extend.

दा dā, a verbal root ; whence the verb *dadāmi*, I give.

Pers. dādan, to give.

Greek, δίδωμι, δόω.

Latin, do.

Celtic, DAIGH, a root in Erse ; whence daighim, I give.

अद् ad, a verbal root ; whence the verb ADMI, *atsi*, ATTI, edo, ediš, edit.

Greek, ἔδω.

Latin, edo, esu, etc.

Celtic, YSU, or ESU, edere ; ysawl, edax, Welsh.

> ITH, a root in Erse ; whence ithim, I eat; itheadh, eating.

युज् yuj, a verbal root ; whence are derived several verbs meaning to join, and other words, as follows :

> YUGAM, a couple ; YUGAH, a yoke.
>
> YOJĀMI, pret. YUYOJA (conjungere, conjugare).
>
> yunajmi, pret. yuyoja (jungere) and yokshyāmi.

Pers. YŪ, a yoke, also yūgh.

> yūghīdan, to yoke.

Greek, ζεύγνυμι, ζύγος κ τ. λ.

Latin, jungo, jugum.

Russ. jgo, a yoke.

Teut. joch (Germ.), yoke (Eng.)

Celtic,

> 1. Welsh, JAU, a yoke ; JEUAW, to yoke.
>
>> JEUAD, a yoking : JEUAETH, a yoked state.

> N.B. The Welsh words are nearer to the Sanskrit and Persian than to the European languages.

> 2. Erse, cuing, or kuing, a yoke.
>
>> jeugaff, to yoke or couple. (Armoric. Lhuyd, p. 245.)

दंश् dans, a verbal root ; whence the verbs DA-

SHĀMI and DAKSHYĀMI (mordeo), to bite.
    Noun, DANTA, a tooth.
Greek, δάκνω, n. ὀδόντα.
Latin, dens, dentes.
Celtic,
    Welsh, daint, n. aggr. the teeth.
             dant, pl. dannedh.
             deintiaw, verb, to bite.
    Corn.   danta, to bite.

The following verbs, or etymons of verbs, are common to the Celtic and some of the other European languages. Where the resemblance is only with the Latin, it may be thought probable that the Britons derived them from the Romans; but when the coincidence is between the Celtic and Greek, or Sanskrit, or other remote branches, the fact will admit of no similar explanation.

dagru and deigraw (W.)	δακρύω	
and	and	
deigryn (W.)	δάκρυον	lachryma.
darhunaw	δαρθάνω	
dëu, and		
dyvod (W.), to come	δύω and δύνω	
donet (Armor.)		
dysgu (W.)	διδάσκω	disco et doceo
dylu, and	δεῖ and δοῦλος	
dylÿaw, to be obliged (W.)	δουλεύω	
dyroï (W.)	δωρέω	
canu (W.), sing	cano	gānam (Sa.)
canam (Erse)		singing, song

iachâu, to heal, from iâch, sane, whole	ἰάομαι	
cusau, cusanu (W.), to kiss	κύσω (Greek.) küssen (Ger.)	kuṣ and kuṣ- yāmi (San.), amplector.
elu (W.), to go	ἐλεύθω	
elsynt, they came	ἥλυσαν	
galw (W.), to call	καλέω	call
cleiniaw (W.), to lie	κλίνειν	
cleisiaw (W.), to bruise	κλάω, κλάσω et κλάσις	
cudhiaw (W.), to hide, kîth and kitha, Cornish	κεύθω	
curaw, to beat, knock	κρούω	
cyriaw, to limit, border	κείρω	
chwareü, to gambol, sport	χαιρέω	
balâü, to spring out, and balaw, noun	βαλλέσθαι βολὴ, ἐκβολὴ	
dalw, to catch	δέλω, inesco	
eb, to say, as eb eve, said he	ἔπω, dico ἔφη, said he	
elwi, to gain	ἐλεῖν	
ambylu, to blunt ambylus, blunt, adj.	ἀμβλύνω ἀμβλὺς	mlānah (S.), languid.
degadu	δεκατόω	
eichiaw, to sound from aich, pl. eichiau	ἠχέω, n. ἦχος, pl. ἠχέα	
gwthiaw and wthiaw, to thrust	ὠθέω	
lholiaw, to babble	λαλέω	
lhipâu, to droop	ἐλλείπειν	
maelu, to earn wages	μελετάω	
men, a place,	μενέω	

15

medw, the mind	μηδέω	medito
meru to droop		
merwinaw, to benumb, or deaden	μαραίνω	
tormu, to assemble round	turma	
ystyr and ystyriaw, to consider, note, reflect	ἱστορέω	
caru, to love	carus	
cob, cobio, to strike	κόπτω	
menw, mind	man (S.), to know, under-stand.	mens (Lat.)
novio (W.) snav (E.)	νέω, no (Lat.)	
credu (W.) credeim (E.)	credo	
eliaw (W.)	ἀλείφω	
dosparthu	dispertior	

SECTION V.

Adjectives, Pronouns, and Particles.

Parag. 1.   ADJECTIVES.

आल ālah, ā, m. (ample, vast.)
> all, alle, whole, Germ.
> ὅλος, Gr. hôll, oll, Welsh ; uile, Erse.

उच: uchchah, ā. m. (high).
> uch, higher, upper ; uchel, uchach. (W.)
> uchchatā, pride (Sanskrit) ; uchediad, soar-
>   ing (Welsh).

ὑψοῦ, Greek. Compare ὕψηλος and uchel in Welsh.

hoch, high. Germ.

महा and महत्, mahā and mahat, great.
Greek, μέγα. Latin, magnus, major.
Welsh, mawr. Erse, môr.
Germ. mehr, more, etc.

युवन् yuvan.
yuvan, Pers.
jau, jeuant, jeuanc, Welsh.
juvenes, juvencus, Latin.
jung, young, Germ.; yanuii, Russian.

जीन: jínah, an old man.
sean, Erse; hên, Welsh; senex, Lat.

नव nava (Am. Cosh.).
Greek, νέος; Latin, novus.
Germ. neu, new; Russian, novaii.
Celtic, newydh, Welsh; nuadh, Erse.

The following are chiefly adjectives common to the Celtic and the Greek languages.

alh (W.)	eile (E.)	ἄλλος	alius
côch		κόκκινος	
cloff		χωλὸς	claudus
medhws	misgeach	μέθυσος	
melus, sweet	milis	μειλίσσω	
melyn, yellow		μήλινος	
tlawd		τάλας	
caled		χάλεπος	
câr	chara	χαρίεις	carus
trist	tuirseach	τρυσσὸς	tristis

byr	gear	κυρτὸς	brevis
either		ἕτεροι	cæteri
ambylus		ἄμβλυς	
dilys		δῆλος	
twym		{θερμὸς / θέμερος}	
iachâus		ἰήϊος	

Parag. 2. PRONOUNS.

The personal pronouns must be given in full when we proceed to the inflections of verbs, which are conjugated by means of them. It is only requisite at present to anticipate the remark, of the truth of which the reader will be afterwards convinced, that the personal pronouns in the Celtic dialects consist of the very same elements, and these but slightly modified, which pervade all, or nearly all, the other languages referred to the Indo-European class.

The possessive pronouns are in the Celtic formed, as in other languages, by a modification in the ending of the corresponding personal pronouns.

Thus in Welsh.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS.			POSSESSIVES.
1 Sing.	mi, I,	becomes	mau
2 ,,	ti, thou,	,,	tau
3 Sing. masc.	ev, in Erse se,	,,	ei
fem.	hi, in Erse si,	,,	ei
1 Plur.	ni, we,	,,	ein
2 ,,	chwi,	,,	eich
3 ,,	hwy or hwynt	,,	eu

The interrogative pronouns serve to exemplify the remarks made on the interchange of consonants in chapter 1, section 2.

Interrogative Pronoun.

In Greek. $\tau i \varsigma$ τi.

N.B. The existence of the interrogative particles $\pi \hat{\omega} s$, $\pi o \hat{\iota}$, etc. renders it probable that there was an older Greek interrogative pronoun corresponding, as $\pi i s$, πi.

In Latin,	quis quæ	quid
	qui	
In Erse,	kia	kidh
		kad
In Sanskrit,	kah kā	kim
In Welsh,	pwy	pa.

Parag. 3. PARTICLES.

ni—na (Welsh)	$\nu \dot{\eta}$	na (Sansk.)
yna	$\ddot{\iota} \nu a$	
wng, yng, near	$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \grave{\upsilon} s$	
agaws, or agos, prep.	$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \grave{\upsilon} s$	
cyd, cyda, pron. cŭda	$\kappa a \tau \grave{a}$	
am, round	$\dot{a} \mu \phi \grave{\iota}$	um in German.
heb, without	$\dot{a} \pi \grave{o}$	ab, abs
oc, out of	$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$	ex
trwy		through, durch
yn	$\dot{\epsilon} \nu$	
neu, particle of affirmation	$\nu a \grave{\iota}$	
cyn, with, cum, con (Latin)	$\sigma \grave{\upsilon} \nu$ (G.) सम्, sam (Sans.)	
either	$\ddot{a} \tau \epsilon \rho$	
di (insep. part.) di, dis (Latin)	$\delta \grave{\iota}$	

dyre, veni	δεῦρο
evo	ἅμα
etto	ἔτι yet
mo, negative ⎱	⎰ μὰ
after ni ⎰	⎱ οὐ μὰ
blaen	πλὴν

CHAPTER IV.

Proofs of a common origin derived from the grammatical structure of the Celtic and other Indo-European languages.

SECTION I.

Review of the preceding facts and inferences.—Introductory remarks on the personal inflections of verbs.

THE instances which have been pointed out in the last chapter, to which I believe that it would be easy to make great additions, are sufficient to prove that there is an extensive affinity in the component vocabularies of the Celtic dialects and those of the other languages with which they have been compared. The examples of analogy already adduced are by far too numerous and too regular, or in accordance with certain general observations, to be the result of mere chance or accidental coincidence. It must likewise be remarked that they are found in that class of words which are not commonly derived from one language into another. I allude particularly to such terms as denote the most familiar objects and relations, for which no tribe of people is without expressive terms. When such relations as those of father, mother, brother, and sister are expressed by really cognate words, an affinity between the several languages in which these analogies

are found is strongly indicated. The same remark may be made in respect to the names of visible bodies and the elements of nature, such as sun, moon, air, sky, water, earth. Lastly, the inference is confirmed by finding many of the verbal roots of most frequent occurrence, as the verb substantive, and those which express generation, birth, living, dying, knowing, seeing, hearing, and the like, to be common to all these languages.

It may be remarked, that in the Celtic language, as well as in the Persian, and in some German dialects, the Sanskrit and Greek words are represented by terms in a shortened and broken form, which have lost the regularity and beauty of their terminations.[12] Yet there are several instances in which the Celtic words resemble more nearly their Sanskrit analogues than those belonging to other European languages, as the terms tâd and brawd for tātah and bhrātā, meaning father and brother. In many examples the Sclavonic dialects and the Persian language display the transition from the form of words peculiar to the Sanskrit to that of the northern European idioms. The root sru, meaning to hear, becomes in Russian slu; but in Greek and in Celtic κλυ and clyw, or clu. Aswah, a horse, becomes asp in Persian, and in Erse each. Sūkarah, a hog, is in Persian khúk, and in Welsh hwch. In most cases we discover something to confirm the laws of deviation laid down in the preceding chapters, according to which it appears

that words derived by the western from the eastern
languages are changed in a peculiar way. The most
general of these alterations is the substituting of
guttural for sibilant letters, which by the Celtic
dialects is made almost uniformly, and very fre-
quently by the Greek and the Teutonic.

There is a still more striking resemblance in the
grammatical forms of these languages, which I shall
now endeavour to point out.

Professor Murray has attempted to illustrate the
grammatical structure of the European languages
from a quarter to which few persons would have
been inclined to look with any hope of success for
the means of its elucidation, I mean the Teutonic
idioms, and even some of the modern dialects of the
German language. It would really appear that in
these idioms some words, affording traces of ancient
forms and derivations, have still survived, which
can no longer be recognised in the classical lan-
guages of India, of Greece, and of Italy. In the
following pages it will more evidently appear, if I
am not mistaken, that from the Celtic dialects a part
of the grammatical inflections—and that a very
important part—common to the Sanskrit, the Æolic
Greek, the Latin, and the Teutonic languages, is
capable of an elucidation which it has never
yet received. This can only be accounted for by
the remark that the Celtic people have been more
tenacious of the peculiarities of their language, as
they have been in many respects of their cus-

toms and manners, than the other nations of Europe.

The mode of conjugating verbs appears to be essentially the same in all these languages. It consists partly in certain variations indicating time and mood, and partly in the addition of particular endings, by which the differences of number and person are denoted. The former class of variations will be considered in the sequel. At present I shall investigate the nature and origin of the personal terminations, or of those increments or suffixes which the verbal roots receive for the purpose of distinguishing the person and number. It will appear that these are all pronominal suffixes, or abbreviated or otherwise modified pronouns. This has been conjectured and shown to be probable by many philological writers, but the proof has always been defective in several particulars, because this subject has not been surveyed in a sufficiently comprehensive manner, and with attention to all the evidence which can be brought to bear upon it, and especially to that portion which is derivable from a comparison of the Celtic dialects.

In proceeding to this investigation, I shall in the first place show by examples what are the characteristic endings of the different persons of the verb in several languages.

NOTE ON SECTION I.

(12). *In the Celtic language words are represented by terms in a shortened and broken form, which have lost the regularity of their*

terminations.—This assumes that the inflections of the present language are non-existent, because they have been lost. But what if they have never been developed? A fuller exposition of the exception here suggested is to be found in the notes (by the present editor) upon Dr. Young's article on Language in the last edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica.

SECTION II.

Personal endings of the Sanskrit verbs.

One system of personal terminations belongs to all Sanskrit verbs, and the differences of conjugation which are distinguished by grammarians, consist in the changes which the verbal roots undergo. The following is an example displaying the terminations of the present tense as they are subjoined to the verbal root tud, to strike, in Latin tundo.

	1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Singular,	Tudāmi	Tudasi	Tudati
Dual,	Tudāvas	Tudathas	Tudatas
Plural,	Tudāmas	Tudatha	Tudanti.

This verb belongs to those classes of roots which insert a vowel *a* between the theme and the personal endings. Others subjoin these endings immediately. The personal endings alone are as follows :—

	1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Sing.	-mi	-si	ti
Dual,	-vas	-thas	-tas
Plur.	-mas	-tha	-anti.

The same terminations belong to the future tenses as to the present; but those tenses which have the augment prefixed to the verb have the personal endings, as in Greek, in a more contracted form. The following is the first preterite of the verb tudāmi, corresponding closely to the Greek imperfect.[a]

<div align="center">Præteritum augmentatum 1.</div>

	1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Sing.	Atudam	Atudas	Atudat
Dual,	Atudāva	Atudatam	Atudatām
Plur.	Atudāma	Atudata	Atudan.

The abbreviated personal endings in Sanskrit verbs are as follows:

	1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Sing.	-am	-s	-t
Dual,	-va	-tam	-tām
Plur.	-ma	-ta	-an.[b]

There is another form of the indicative tenses in the parasmaipada, or active voice, which it may be right here to exhibit. It is that of the reduplicated preterite, formed by rules nearly the same as those of the preterperfect in Greek verbs. The præteritum reduplicatum of the verb tud or tudāmi is as follows:

	1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Sing.	Tutoda[c]	Tutoditha	Tutoda
Dual,	Tutudiva	Tutudathus	Tutudatus
Plur.	Tutudima	Tutuda	Tutudus.

---

[a] I represent the augment अ by an *a* in following Sir W. Jones's orthography; but it might perhaps as correctly be represented by the Greek ε.

[b] Bopp, Gram. Crit. Sansk., p. 144.   [c] In Latin, tutudi.

N.B. It may be observed that the vowel of the root, *u*, is changed into *o* in this instance by the form termed *guna*, of the influence of which we trace the result in the Greek reduplicate preterite of the old form, commonly termed the preterperfect of the middle voice. We shall observe likewise the influence of guna to be very extensive in the inflections of verbs in the different European languages.

SECTION III.

Terminations characteristic of the persons of the Greek verb.

Of the two principal forms of inflection by which Greek verbs are conjugated, one, viz. that of verbs in μι, corresponds nearly with the Sanskrit. There are strong reasons for believing this to be an ancient and perhaps the original method of conjugating verbs used in the Greek language,[a] independently of the circumstance that it so nearly resembles the forms of the Sanskrit. This conjugation comprises the verb substantive and a great many old and very anomalous and defective verbs, and those of very common and familiar occurrence.[b] The conjugations of verbs in ω are so much more regular, that they bear the appearance of a designed and systematic scheme introduced for the sake of simplifying the inflections of the language. The Doric form of the verbs in μι will probably serve to exemplify

[a] Matthiæ, indeed, seems inclined to believe that there was a still older form of Greek verbs than those now extant, and that the termination was in ω.

[b] As φημὶ, εἶμι, ἵημι, ἧμαι, etc.

the personal endings as they existed in the
earliest state of the Greek language of which
we can obtain any knowledge. The following is
the Doric form of the verb ἵστημι in the present
tense :

	1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Sing.	ἵσταμι	ἵστας	ἵστατι
Dual,	——	ἵστατον	ἵστατον
Plur.	ἵσταμεν	ἵστατε	ἵσταντι.

The irregular and defective verbs often display
the primitive verbal forms of a language better than
those which are regular, and of the former the verb
substantive, which is anomalous in many languages,
may be considered as the most ancient. The follow-
ing is the present tense of the verb substantive in
its oldest forms.

		Singular.	Old form.
1.	εἰμὶ,	Doric form ἐμμὶ, originally (?)	ἐσμὶ
2.	εἶς ;	in Homer, Pindar, Theocritus,	ἐσσὶ
3.	ἐστὶ		ἐστὶ.

Dual.

1.	——		
2.	ἐστὸν		ἐστὸν
3.	ἐστὸν		ἐστὸν.

Plural.

1.	ἐσμὲν,	Doric εἰμὲς, originally (?)	ἐσμὲς
2.	ἐστὲ		ἐστὲ
3.	εἰσὶ	Doric	ἐντὶ

It seems, from this statement, that the following
are the personal endings of the verb substantive in
the present tense, subjoined immediately to the
verbal root.

	Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
1.	-μι	———	-μες
2.	-σι	-τον	-τε
3.	-τι	-τον	-ντι.

These will be seen on comparison to be nearly identical with the endings of Sanskrit verbs. A like analogy may be traced by comparing the abbreviated form of the augmented preterite with the Greek preterimperfect and the preter reduplicate with the Greek preterperfect; but as it is not my principal aim to trace the analogies of the Sanskrit and Greek languages, I shall say nothing further on this subject.

SECTION IV.

Personal endings in Latin verbs.

It is probable that the first person of the present tense in the indicative mood of Latin verbs terminated originally in *m* instead of *o*. This results from a comparison of the endings of the other persons in the various tenses of the indicative mood, and from the analogy afforded by the first person in the subjunctive mood. The supposition is confirmed by the actual existence of old and anomalous forms, *sum* or *esum*, and *inquam*, where the termination in *m* is still extant.

The personal endings in Latin verbs, exclusive of the imperative mood, may be comprised in the following forms :

Singular.

1.	-am	-em	-im
2.	-as	-es	-is
3.	-at	-et	-it

Plural.

1.	-amus	-emus	-imus
2.	-atis	-etis	-itis
3.	-ant	-ent	-unt, int.

SECTION V.

Terminations which distinguish the persons of verbs in the Teutonic
dialects.

A new and very important light has been thrown
on the structure and history of the Teutonic lan-
guages by the researches of Professor Jacob Grimm.
I shall endeavour to abstract in a short compass
some of the results of his inquiries which relate to
the inflections of verbs in the oldest of these lan-
guages, as being closely connected with the subject
now under consideration.

The verbs are divided in all the Teutonic dialects
into two classes, chiefly distinguished from each
other by the manner in which they form the past
tense and participle. These different modes of inflec-
tion are termed by Dr. Grimm respectively the
strong and weak conjugations.[13] The former is sup-
posed by that writer to be more ancient than the
other, and to be in fact the genuine and primitive
method by which the German nations distinguished

the times and modes of action and of passion in the use of verbs. In this first method a great proportion of the original and peculiar roots of the Teutonic dialects were conjugated; but its use has given way in a great degree to a different scheme of inflection, which of late has become prevalent, as being more in harmony with the genius of modern language. The latter is supposed to be more recent in its origin, and it comprises, besides many primitive German roots, all foreign words which have been adopted into the vocabulary of the Teutonic nations. The English reader will have an idea of the strongly and weakly inflected conjugations by observing that all those verbs belong to the former which make the past tense and participle by changing the vowel of the monosyllabic root, as *speak, spake, spoken ;* while the inflection of *praise, praised, praising,* exemplifies the weak conjugation. In the Mœso-Gothic, which preserves the oldest forms of the Teutonic languages, there is, in addition to the change of vowel which characterises the past tense, a reduplication of a part of the root.[a] There are twelve forms belonging to the strongly inflected verbs, and three or four of the other class. As the characteristic parts of the verbs of each conjugation Dr. Grimm has given the indicative mood, present tense, first person singular, the first person

---

[a] This was observed by Hickes. See his Mœso-Gothic Grammar in Thesaur. Ling. Sept., tom. i.

singular and plural of the past tense, and the participle and infinitive mood.

As the subject of the present chapter is the characteristic endings of persons and numbers, I should not have touched upon anything which relates to the formation of tenses and moods, until I come to the proper place for that inquiry, had it not been for the circumstance that the personal endings themselves are different in the several modes of conjugation. As I wish to include the endings belonging to both systems, I found it necessary to explain, in the first place, the principle by which they are distinguished from each other. I shall now extract a table of the terminations belonging to each form as laid down by Dr. Grimm, beginning with the Mœso-Gothic verbs.

1. Strongly inflected conjugation of Mœso-Gothic verbs.

The following verbs will afford a specimen of this inflection, and display in an interesting manner some of the oldest forms belonging to our own language or that of our Teutonic ancestors.

    1. Slêpa, I sleep; saizlêp, I slept; saizlêpum, we slept; participle, slêpans.

    2. Láia, I laugh; lailô, laughed; láilôum; láians.

    3. Svara, I swear; svôr, I swore; svôrum; svarans.

In this instance, and in the six last of the strongly inflected conjugations, the verb merely changes the radical vowel, and has no reduplication.

Paradigm of the personal endings of verbs of the strongly inflected conjugations.

			1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Indic. Pres.	Sing.		-a	-is	-ith
	Dual		-ôs	-ats	——
	Plur.		-am	-ith	-and
Pret.	Sing.		. . .	-t	. . .
	Dual		-u (?	-uts	——
	Plur.		-um	-uth	-un
Subjunct. Pres.	Sing.		-áu	-áis	-ái
	Dual		-áiva (?)	-áits	——
	Plur.		-áima	-áith	áina
Pret.	Sing.		-jau	-eis	-ei
	Dual		-eiva	-eits	——
	Plur.		-eima	-eith	-eina
Imperative	Sing.		——	. . .	——
	Dual		——	-ats	——
	Plur.		-am	-ith	——

Infinitive -an; Particip. pres. -ands ; Particip. pret. -ans.

N.B.—The mark (. . .) indicates that no additional ending is subjoined to the verb, and the mark (——) that the form for which it stands is wanting.

The following paradigm illustrates the weakly inflected conjugation, of which the verb sôkjan may serve as an example ; sôkjan or sôkyan is suchen, to seek ; sôkja, I seek ; sôkida, I sought ; sôkjands in the participle.

		1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Indicat. mood. } Pres. T.	Sing.	(vowel)	-s	-th
	Dual	-ôs	-ts	——
	Plur.	-m	-th	-nd

			1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
	Pret. T.	Sing.	-da	-des	-da
		Dual	——	-dêduts	——
		Plur.	-dêdum	-dêduth	-dêdun
Subjunct. mood.	Pres. T.	Sing.	(vowel)	-s	(vowel).
		Dual	——	-s	——
		Plur.	-ma	-th	-na
	Pret. T.	Sing.	-dêdján	-dêdeis	-dêdi
		Dual	——	-dêdéits	-dêdeina
Imperat. mood.		Sing.	——	(vowel)	——
		Dual	——	-ts	——
		Plur.	-m	-th	——
Infinitive mood.			-n		

Participle present,	-nds
Participle past,	-ths

Next to the Mœso-Gothic, Dr. Grimm has ranked in the affiliation of Teutonic languages the Old High German, the characteristics of which approach most nearly to those of the Gothic forms. Under this denomination of Alt-hoch-deutsch or Old High German, it must be observed that the remains of several dialects are comprised, which were nearly allied, but yet probably differed from each other in peculiarities now scarcely to be ascertained. Among these were the idioms of the Franks, Bavarians, and Allemanni, and perhaps of other tribes between the seventh and eleventh centuries, of which specimens are preserved in the remains of Kero and Notker, and in the extant works of Ottfried. From these, and from some other relics of the period above

mentioned, this ancient form of the High German language has been made up and restored by the accurate researches of Dr. Grimm.

Forms of the verb in the Old High German.

Forms of the strongly inflected conjugation.

			1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Indicat. mood.	Pres. T.	Sing.	-u	-is	-it
		Plur.	-amês	-at	-ant
	Pret. T.	Sing.	. . .	-i	. . .
		Plur.	-umês	-ut	-un
Subjunct. mood.	Pres. T.	Sing.	-e	-ês	-e
		Plur.	-êmês	-êt	-en
	Pret. T.	Sing.	-i	-is	-i
		Plur.	-îmês	-ît	-în
Imperative		Sing.	——	. . .	——
		Plur.	——	-at	——

Infinitive -an.   Part. pres. -antêr.   Part. preter. -anêr.

As an example of this conjugation we may take the following :

> Slâfu, I sleep.
> Slîaf, I slept.
> Slîafumês, we slept.
> Slâfanêr, having slept.

Paradigm of the weakly inflected verb of the Old High German.

			1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Indicat. mood	Pres. T.	Sing.	-u (-m)	-s	-t
		Plur.	-mês	-t	-nt

			1. Person.	2. Person.	3. Person.
Pret. T.	Sing.		-ta	-tôs	-ta
	Plur.		-tumês	-tut	-tun
Pres. T.	Sing.		(vowel)	-s	(vowel)
	Plur.		-mês	-t	-n
Pret. T.	Sing.		-ti	-tîs	-ti
	Plur.		-tîmês	-tît	-tîn
Imper.	Sing.		——	(vowel)	——
	Plur.		——	-t	——

Subjunct. mood

Infinitive -n.   Part. pres. -ntêr, -têr.

Dr. Grimm has added an analysis of the gram-
matical forms in the other dialects belonging to the
Teutonic family of languages, viz. the Old Saxon,
the Anglo-Saxon, the Old Frisian, the Old Norse or
northern dialect of the Voluspa and the Edda, the
Middle High German, the Middle Netherlandish,
the modern High German, the modern Netherland
dialect, the modern English, the Swedish, and the
Danish.   The comparison of these varying forms of
one original speech is extremely interesting to the
philologer, and indispensable to those who wish to
be thoroughly and fundamentally acquainted with
the relations of our own mother tongue; but it
would be foreign to my present design to pursue
this subject further.   I shall here add merely an
outline of the personal endings of the Gothic and
Old High German verbs in comparison with each
other, confining myself to the present tense.

Personal endings of the Mœso-Gothic and Old
High German verbs in the present tense.

1st Pers. Sing. a vowel (often -a or -u), or -ôm, or êm.
2d Pers. Sing. -is, -ês, -ôs.
3d Pers. Sing. -ith, -it, -êt, -ôt.
1st Pers. Plur. -m, -am, -ames, -emes, -omes, etc.
2d Pers. Plur. -ith, -it, -et, -ôt.
3d Pers. Plur. -nd, -and, -ant, -ent, -ont.

Examples of these terminations which so much resemble the classical languages, and which are now lost to so great a degree in the Germanic dialects, occur in the following verses of a translation of that magnificent hymn of the ancient church, the Te Deum, which I copy from Hickes's Thesaurus.

1. Thih Cot lopemes,   Te Deum laudamus,
   Thih Trutinan gehemes,   Te Dominum confitemur,
   Thih euuigan Fater,   Te æternum Patrem,
   Eokiuuelih erda uuirdit.   Omnis terra veneratur.

2. Thir alle engila, thir himila,   Tibi omnes angeli, tibi cœli,
   Inti allo kiuualtido,   Et universæ potestates,
   Thir Cherubim inti Seraphim   Tibi Cherubim et Seraphim
   Unbilibanlicheru stimmo fo-   Incessabili voce proclamant,
       raharent,

3. Uuiher, uuiher, uuiher,   Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus,
   Truhtin Cot herro,   Dominus Deus Sabaoth.
   Folliu sint himila inti erda   Pleni sunt cœli et terra
   Thera meginchrefti tiurda   Majestatis gloriæ tuæ.
       thinera.

NOTE ON SECTION V.

(13). *Strong and weak conjugations.*—Exceptions to the doctrine that gives two conjugations to one and the same tense, are to be found in the editor's English Language, part iv., chap. xxxix. (fourth edition).

SECTION VI.

Personal endings of verbs in the Sclavonian dialects and in the Persian language.

As the Sclavonian dialects constitute one important branch of the European languages, they must not be entirely passed over in a treatise, the object of which is to point out and illustrate the relations of these idioms to each other. I shall, however, confine myself to one dialect belonging to this division, and on this I shall touch but briefly. The following examples will afford my readers a specimen of the inflection of verbs in the Russian language, so far as the personal endings are concerned; and they will be sufficient to show that these terminations belong to the generally prevailing system which we have traced in other languages.

The Russian verbs are complicated in other respects, but their personal terminations present very little variety. In several tenses these endings are entirely wanting, and the personal pronouns alone distinguish the modifications of meaning; but the present tense has a perfect inflection. The following is the present tense of the verb stoyu, I stand.[a]

	Singular.		Plural.
1.	ya stoyu	mi	stoim
2.	ti stoïsh	vi	stoite
3.	on' stoit	oni	stoyat.

[a] Elémens de la Langue Russe, par M. Charpentier: Petersb. 1768, p. 148.

The following paradigm of the terminations of Russian verbs in the two forms which differ most widely from each other is given by Professor Vater in his excellent Russian Grammar.

First Form.	Fifth Form.
Singular.	Singular.
1. -yu	1. -u
2. -esh	2. -ish
3. et	3. -it
Plural.	Plural.
1. -em	1. im
2. -ete	2. -ite
3. -yut	3. yat.[b]

The Persian verbs display the same general analogy; their terminations are even more nearly allied to those of the Teutonic verbs than the Sclavonian. Of this the reader will judge from the present tense of the verb substantive, which is regarded as a model for the variations of the persons in all tenses.

Sing. 1. -am   2. -ī   3. -ast
Plur. 1. -īm   2. -īd   3. -and

The following is the preterite of the verb būdan, and may serve as an example of past tenses in general.

Sing. 1. būdam   2. būdī   3. būd
Plur. 1. būdīm   2. būdīd   3. būdand.

---

[b] Dr. Johann Severin Vater's Praktische Grammatik der Russischen Sprache, p. 88.

SECTION VII.

Terminations characterising the persons and numbers of verbs in the
Celtic languages.

I now proceed to the personal endings of verbs
in the Celtic language; and as they appear to have
been preserved in a more complete state in the
Welsh than in any other dialect of this language, I
shall take the Welsh verbs at present as my prin-
cipal subject. In the sequel, the formations peculiar
to the Erse will be examined, and compared with
those belonging to other idioms.

It has been observed, that the Teutonic verbs
have only one form for the future and the present
tense. The same remark applies to the Welsh; for
the Welsh language, except in the instance of the
verb substantive, which has two distinct forms, one
for the present and the other for the future tense,
has only one modification of the verb, which is used
to represent both. In the German dialects the single
form above referred to is properly a present tense;
but the Welsh grammarians consider that their lan-
guage has only a future, and say that the future is
put for the present. It is, however, used as such in
cases where no license of expression or trope can
have place, as in the Creed: " Credav yn Nuw
Dâd," Credo in Deum Patrem.

The Welsh verbs present a considerable variety

in their terminations, as the following examples will show.

First Form, Future Tense, of the verb *caru, to love.*

Singular.	Plural.
1. carav	carwn
2. ceri, *i.e.* keri	cerwch
3. câr	carant

It must be noticed that the third person of the future tense is the root of the verb. The endings of the other persons are pronominal suffixes, as we shall clearly perceive in the sequel. The termination of the first person in *av* is equivalent to *amh*, or the *v* to a soft *m*. In the present tense of verbs in the Erse dialect the corresponding termination is always *aim* or *im*.

Second Form, Preterperfect Tense.[a]

Singular.	Plural.
1. cerais	carasom
2. ceraist	carasoch
3. carodh	carasant

Third Form, Preterpluperfect Tense.

Singular.	Plural.
1. carwn	carem
2. carit	carech
3. carai	carent

[a] It may be worth while to add the same tense of the verb substantive, as it displays somewhat more strikingly the affinity of the Celtic to other European inflections.

1. bûm	fui	buom	fuimus.
2. buost	fuisti	buoch	fuistis.
3. bu	fuit	buont	fuerunt.

The preterpluperfect caraswn changes its endings exactly as the foregoing.

There are some other varieties, an account of which will be given in a following chapter. It is only my object at present to deduce a general principle.

The following are the terminations. I begin with the plural, as presenting more regularity.

<div align="center">Plural Terminations.</div>

1st Form.	2d Form.	3rd Form.	4th Form.
1. -wn	-om	-em	-ym
2. -wch	-och	-ech	-ych
3. -ant	-ant	-ent	-ynt

The fourth column contains a modification used by the poets.

The terminations proper to the singular number are as follows :

1st Form.	2d Form.	3d Form.
1. -av	-ais	-wn
2. -i	-aist	-it
3. no addition to the root.	-odh[b]	-ai

It will be observed at once that there is sufficient resemblance between these inflections and those of other Indo-European languages to connect them indubitably with that class. This is particularly manifest in the plural endings. There are some apparent anomalies, but these will be explained in the sequel, and will be found illustrative of the general result to be deduced.

---

[b] Note, *dh*, commonly written *dd*, is pronounced as *th* in other.

CHAPTER V.

Of the personal pronouns in the Indo-European languages, and of the derivation of the personal terminations of verbs.

SECTION I.

Personal pronoun of the first person.

HAVING examined in the preceding chapter the systems of terminations which characterise the persons of verbs, I now proceed to compare with them the personal pronouns still extant in the same languages, and to show that the endings of verbs which distinguish the persons and numbers are supplied by abbreviated forms of those pronouns subjoined to the verbal roots. In what degrees the pronouns belonging to each language have contributed to the formation of these endings or suffixes will appear in the course of the following investigation.

Personal pronoun of the first person in the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Russian, Mœso-Gothic, and Old High German languages.

SINGULAR.

Nominative.

अहम् aham ; ἐγὼν, ἐγώ, ἴωγα, ἴωνγα; ego ; ya, Russ.; ik, Goth. ; ih, O. H. Germ.

Genitive.

मम mama and मे me; μέθεν, ἐμέο, μοῦ; mei;

menya, Russ.; meina, Goth.; mîn, Old High German.

Dative.

मह्यम् mahyam and मे me; ἐμὶν, ἐμοὶ, μοί; mihi; mne, Russ.; mis, Goth.; mir, Old H. German.

Accusative.

माम् mām and मा mā; ἐμὲ μὲ ἐμίν; me; menya, Russ.; mik, Goth.; mih, O. H. German.

Ablative.

मत् mat; ἀπ ἐμοῦ; a, me, etc.

Instrumental.

मया mayā; me, Lat.; mnoiu and mnoǐ, Russ.

Locative.

मयि mayi; in me.

Præpositive.

mné, Russ.

DUAL.

Nominative.

आवाम् āvām; ἄμμε, νῶϊ, νώ; vit, Goth.; wiz (?) O. H. Germ.

Genitive.

आवयोस् āvayos and नौ nau; νῶϊν, νῶν; ugkara, Goth.; unchar, O. H. Germ.

Dative.

आवाभ्याम् āvābhyām and नौ nau; νῶϊν, νών; ugkis, Goth.; unch, O. H. Germ.

Accusative.

आवाम् avām and नौ nau; ἄμμε, νῶϊ, νώ; ugkis, Goth.; unch, O. H. Germ.

Ablative and Instrumental.

आवाभ्याम् āvābhyām.

Locative.

आवयोस् āvayos.

PLURAL.

Nominative.

वयम् vayam ; ἄμες, *i.e.* vames, ἡμέες, ἡμεῖς ; nos ; mi, Russ. ; veis, Goth. ; wîr, O. H. Germ.

Genitive.

अस्माकम् asmākam ; ἀμῶν, ἡμῶν ; nas, Russ. ; unsara, Goth. ; unsar, O. H. Germ. ; our.

Dative.

अस्मभ्यम् asmabhyam and नस् nas ; ἀμῖν, ἡμῖν ; nobis ; name, Russ. ; unsis, Goth. ; uns, O. H. Germ.

Accusative.

अस्मान् asmān and नस् nas ; ἄμμας ἡμέας ; nos ; nas, Russ. ; unsis (uns), Goth. ; unsih, Old H. Germ.

Ablative.

अस्मत् asmat ; ἀφ' ἡμῶν ; à nobis.

Instrumental.

अस्माभिस् asmābhis ; nobis ; nami, Russ.

Locative.

अस्मासु asmāsu ; in nobis.

Præpositive.

nas, Russ.

Note. An attentive examination will enable the reader to ascertain, that, notwithstanding the great variety of these pronouns and their inflections, a few common elements are the

foundation of them all. A satisfactory analysis of the Sanskrit pronoun has been given us by Professor Bopp, who has dissected the elements which enter into its declension with his usual ingenuity and discernment. His object is the Sanskrit pronoun, but his remarks may tend to elucidate the corresponding forms in all the cognate languages. He observes that the Sanskrit aham, ego, which is quite unconnected with its oblique cases, consists of two elements, viz. अह, AH and अम, AM; the latter is a mere termination, occurring as such in other pronouns : AH is the root. Compare it with ih, ik, ek, ego, h being considered as a guttural consonant. The oblique cases in the Sanskrit pronoun are derived from two similar roots म ma and मे me, which, however, have no existence as distinct words in the Sanskrit language. We may observe that from a root allied to the last, the oblique cases in the European languages are formed. This root is not to be found as an independent word, or as a nominative case in any of those idioms of which the pronouns have been hitherto compared. We shall discover it in the Celtic.

The plural nominative is वे VE, prefixed to the above-mentioned termination AM. The plural oblique cases come from an etymon common to all these languages, but not existing in any of them as a distinct word. From it we derive the Russian *nas*, and ὦνϊ and nos in Greek and Latin. We shall find this etymon to be the Celtic nominative plural. Asmān and ἄμμε (originally ἄσμε. as also ὔμμε was ὔσμε ?) contain an epenthesis of sma.

M. Bopp supposes the endings of the cases to have been formed by involved prepositions; as ASMĀBHIS, nobis, from the Sanskrit preposition abhi, added to the elements of the word. The same termination is to be traced in the Latin nobis, and perhaps in the Greek ἡμῖν, which may have been originally ἡμιφίν or ἀμμιφίν. On this subject M. Bopp refers to a dissertation of his own on the origin of cases, in the Abhandlungen der Historisch-Philologischen Klasse der K. akad. der Wissenchaften (viz. at Berlin), ann. 1826.

SECTION II.

Pronoun of the second person.

SINGULAR.

Nominative.

त्वम् twam; τὺ, σὺ, τύγα; tu; tü, Russ.; thu, M. Goth.; dû, O. H. Germ.

Genitive.

तव tava or ते te; τέο, τεῦς, σέο, etc.; tui; tebyà, Russ.; theina, Goth.; dìn, O. H. Germ.

Dative.

तुभ्यम् tubhyam and ते te; τὶν, τεῖν, σοί; tibi; tebé, Russ.; thus, Goth.; dir, O. H. Germ.

Accusative.

त्वाम् twâm and त्वा twâ; τὺ, σέ; te; tebya, Russ.; thuk, Goth.; dih, O. H. Germ.

Ablative.

त्वत् twat; a te.

Instrumental.

त्वया twayâ; te; toboyu, toboi, Russ.

Locative.

त्वयि twayi.

Præpositive.

tébé, Russ.

DUAL.

Nominative.

युवाम् yuvâm; ὔμμε, σφῶϊ, σφῶ; yut (?), Goth.; yiz, iz (?), O. H. Germ.

Genitive.

युवयोस् yuvayos and वाम् vām; ïgqvara, Goth.; inchar, O. H. Germ.

Dative.

युवाभ्यम् yuvābhyam and वाम् vām; ὔμμε, χ. τ. λ. ïgqvis, Goth.; inch, O. H. Germ.

Accusative.

Sanskrit and Greek the same as the nom.; Gothic and Old High German the same as the dative.

Ablative and Instrumental.

युवाभ्यम् yuvābhyam.

Locative.

युवयोस् yuvayos.

PLURAL.

Nominative.

युयम् yuyam; ὔμεες, ὔμες, χ. τ. λ.; vos; vü, Russ.; yus, Goth.; îr, O. H. German.

Genitive.

युष्माकम् yushmākam and वस् vas; ὑμέων, ὔμων; vostrum, vestrum; vas, Russ.; ïzvara, Goth.; iwar, O. H. Germ.

Dative.

रुष्मभ्यम् yushmabhyam, वस् vas; ὑμῖν; vobis; vam, Russ.; ïzvis, Goth.; iu, O. H. Germ.

Accusative.

युष्मान् yushmān, वस् vas; ὑμέας, ὑμᾶς; vos; vas, Russ.; ïzvis, Goth.; iwih, O. H. Germ.

Ablative.

युष्मत् yushmat; a vobis.

Instrumental.

युष्माभिस् yushmābhis; vobis; vami, Russ.

Locative.

युष्मासु yushmāsu.

Præpositive.

vas, Russ.

Note. The pronouns of the second person are susceptible of
an analysis similar to that of the preceding, as may be seen by
the reader of Bopp's critical observations on these pronouns in his
Sanskrit Grammar. The cases of the singular number are formed
from the elements तु tu, (as nominative twam), and त्व twa, or त्वे
twe. The dual cases are formed from युव yuva, and agree in
terminations with those of the pronoun of the first person.
The plural cases are formed from यु yu, and from वस् vas, or vos.

SECTION III.

Pronouns of the third person.

THE pronouns of the third person are still more
varied and numerous in their inflections than the
preceding. The personal pronouns of the third
person, which are properly so termed, and chiefly in
use as such, appear to have little or no relation
either to the corresponding personal pronoun in
Sanskrit, or to the personal endings of verbs. But
there are some other words in these languages,
which, though chiefly used as demonstrative pro-
nouns or definite articles, appear to have been ori-
ginally personal pronouns. For example, the definite
article in Greek was used, as Matthiæ has observed,

for οὗτος, and was in fact a pronoun. It bears also in its forms a near analogy to the Sanskrit personal pronoun. The Gothic demonstrative pronoun or article SA, SO, THATA is closely allied to both of these, and all the three were apparently the same word very slightly modified. The Latin pronoun approaching most nearly to these is ISTE. I shall collate the forms of all of them, that the reader may perceive their affinities. It must be observed, that the chief reason for selecting these rather than any other pronouns of the third person is the circumstance, that the verbal endings of the third person which have been traced in the preceding chapter are perhaps formed by suffixes, or abbreviations of them, and are quite unconnected with those personal pronouns, which in the actual state of the respective languages are more regularly used as such.

Matthiæ has conjectured that the primitive form of what is called the definite article in Greek was τὸς, τή, τὸ; but the analogy of permutations indicates the aspirate to have taken place rather of a sibilant than of a dental, and it is probable that σὸς, σὰ, τὸ, was the form which preceded the present one. Yet the sigma is peculiar to the masculine and feminine nominative, and the real etymon of the pronoun must have been in Greek similar to the root which exists in Sanskrit and the other cognate languages. तत् tat, is the nominal root, as given by grammarians, but the real etymon, as Professor Bopp has observed, must have been त ta ; and त ta, τὸ, te,

and tha seem to have been the roots in the Sanskrit,
Greek, Latin, and Teutonic languages. Iste is pro-
bably a compound word formed of ɪs the personal
pronoun and an old demonstrative, strikingly ana-
logous to the Sanskrit personal pronoun.

Singular.

Nominative.

	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	NEUTER.
Sansk.	सस् sas, or सः sah.	सा sā	तत् tat
Greek	ὁ or σὁ	ἡ or σὰ	τὸ
Gothic	sa	so	thata
O.H.G.	dër	diu	daz
Latin	is·te	is-ta	is-tud

Genitive.

Sansk.	तस्य tasya	तस्यास् tasyās	तस्य tasya
Greek	τοῖο, τοῦ	τᾶς, τῆς	τοῖο, τοῦ
Gothic	this	thizôs	this
O.H.G.	dës	dërâ	dës
Latin	istius	istius	istius

Dative.

Sansk.	तस्मै tasmai	तस्यै tasyai	तस्मै tasmai
Greek	τῷ (τῶϊ)	τᾷ, τῇ (τᾶϊ)	τῷ (τῶϊ)
Gothic	thamma	thizái	thamma
O.H.G.	dëmu	dëru	dëmu
Latin	isti	istæ (istai)	isti

Accusative.

	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	NEUTER.
Sansk.	तम् tam	ताम् tām	तत् tat
Greek	τὸν	τὴν, τὰν	τὸ
Gothic	thana	thô	thata
O.H.G.	dën ·	dia	daz
Latin	istum	istam	istud

Ablative.

Sansk.	तस्मात् tasmāt	तस्यास् tasyās	तस्मात् tasmāt

Instrumental.

Sansk.	तेन tena	तया tayā	तेन tena
Latin	isto	istâ	isto

Locative.

Sansk.	तस्मिन् tasmin	तस्याम् tasyām	तस्मिन् tasmin

DUAL.

Nominative and Accusative.

Sansk.	तौ tau	ते te	ते te
Greek	τὼ	τὰ	τὼ

Genitive and Dative in Greek.

Instrumental, Dative, and Accusative in Sanskrit.

Sansk.	ताभ्याम् tābhyām ——		——
Greek	τοῖν	ταῖν	τοῖν

PLURAL.

Nominative.

Sansk.	ते te	तास् tās	तनि tani
Greek	οἱ (σοὶ)	αἱ (σαὶ)	τὰ
Gothic	thái	thôs	thô
O.H.G.	diê	diô	diu
Latin	isti	istæ	ista

Genitive.

	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	NEUTER.
Sansk.	तेषाम् teshām	तासाम् tāsām	तेषाम् teshām
Greek	τῶν	τῶν	τῶν
Gothic	thizê	thizô	thizê
O.H.G.	derô	dero	dërô
Latin	istorum (isto-sum)	istarum (ista-sum)	istorum (istosum)

Dative.

Sansk.	तेभ्यस् tebhyas	ताभ्यस् tābhyas	तेभ्यस् tebhyas
Greek	τοῖς	ταῖς	τοῖς
Gothic	thaim	thaim	thaim
O.H.G.	dêm	dêm	dêm
Latin	istis (istobus)	istis (istabus)	istis (istobus)

Accusative.

Sansk.	तान् tān	तास् tās	तनि tani
Greek	τούς	τὰς	τὰ
Gothic	thans	thôs	thô
O.H.G.	diê	diô	diu
Latin	istos	istas	ista

Ablative in Sanskrit same as Dative.

Instrumental.

Sansk.	तैस् tais	ताभिस् tābhis	तैस् tais
Greek	τοῖς	ταῖς	τοῖς
Latin	istis	istis (istabus)	istis

Locative.

Sansk.	तेषु teshu	तासु tāsu	तेषु teshu

SECTION IV.

General observations on the preceding facts.

It will be apparent on a survey of the foregoing table, that the pronouns of the third person bear as near a relation to each other, in the several languages compared, as do those of the first and second. These relations, as well as the analogies discoverable in the former tables, are chiefly evident in the oblique cases, though by comparing the nominatives merely they might be recognised.

But in the multiplicity of terminations which the declension of these pronouns displays, it will be in vain to look for the pronominal suffixes of the system of verbs. The variety of endings precludes the hope of any certain discoveries in this respect. And if we confine our examination to the nominative cases of the pronouns, which alone can be taken into the account with strict propriety, we find only one which contains exactly the ending connected with the personal verb. In all the languages compared in the preceding tables, the termination of the first person plural is in amus, ames, ame, or am. This in the older forms of the Greek language is the pronoun of the corresponding person. If in other instances such a correspondence were discoverable, the problem which refers to the actual origin of the verbal

inflections would be solved. But this unfortunately is not the case; and hence many philological writers and grammarians still deem it uncertain on what principle these varieties in the endings of the verb were really formed; and those who consider them as dependent upon pronominal suffixes have been rather inclined to lay down this position as a probable one, than as established by decisive proofs.

In this state of the question it is fortunate that there is one idiom in which the personal pronouns, as well as the verbal suffixes, have been preserved in a form apparently much less altered from their original one, than in any of the more celebrated and classical dialects, in which philologists have in general sought the means of elucidating the structure of language. I allude to the Celtic dialects, and particularly to that still spoken by the Welsh people, but which is found in a much more perfect state in the productions of British writers coeval with, or even of greater antiquity than, the oldest compositions of the Anglo-Saxons. The preservation of the pronouns in the Welsh language during so long a period of time has perhaps resulted from the circumstance, that in that idiom they are undeclinable words, whereas in most of the European dialects they are susceptible, as we have seen, of copious inflection and variety of endings. The terminations of words in general are but little capable of change in the Celtic idioms, as indeed are those idioms themselves, of which the people appear ever

to have been remarkably tenacious. It would per-
haps not be going too far to say, that no language
in Europe has undergone so little change in an
equal space of time as the Welsh sustained during
the centuries which intervened between Aneurin
and Lhywarch and the period when the Sacred
Scriptures were translated into it. To whatever cir-
cumstances the fact is to be attributed, it seems to
be certain, as I hope to make it sufficiently apparent,
that the Celtic idioms preserve, in a more perfect
state than any other languages of Europe or Asia,
the original pronouns of which abbreviated forms
enter as suffixes into the inflections of verbs through
the numbers and persons.

That the resources afforded by the Celtic dialects
have not yet been applied to the elucidation of
grammatical forms in the European languages, in
general, has arisen, as I apprehend, from the fact
that inquiries of this description have been pursued
chiefly by German scholars, who, owing to local cir-
cumstances, have been little acquainted with these
provincial idioms of the British isles. It will be my
endeavour, in the course of the following investiga-
tion, to supply the deficiency; but before I enter
upon this part of my task, I shall beg leave to set
before my readers some passages from Professor
Grimm's Analysis of the Teutonic Languages, in
order to show how far the inquiry respecting the
origin of verbal inflections has already advanced,
and what remains to be done, or to be attempted.

The characteristic terminations of person and number in the Teutonic verbs, which, as we have seen, have such endings closely analogous to those of other European languages, are thus deduced by Professor Grimm.

The ending of the first person singular seems, as he observes, to have been originally M. This, however, is in many instances defective, and has been more lately softened into N. The second person singular is characterized by a final s; the third person by TH.

The first person plural added originally to the final M of the singular number an s (with a vowel interposed), which however was gradually dropped.

The second person plural had TH, like the third person singular, adding perhaps an s (with an interposed vowel), which was afterwards rejected.

Lastly, the third person plural had ND, of which the D again is in many instances defective.

The dual seems originally to have had vs in the first person, and TS in the second, and in the third to have been wanting.

The imperative mood in the strongly inflected conjugation entirely rejects any personal inflection, and it makes the second person dual and plural, as well as the first person plural, perhaps also the first person dual, like the indicative, while it always wants the first and third persons singular. The characteristic of the infinitive mood is the consonant N,

which however is wanting in several dialects. It
may be remarked, that the indicative mood has the
personal characteristics in a more complete state
than the conjunctive mood, and the present tense
than the preterite tense. Moreover, the first and
third persons of the preterite invariably want the
characteristic consonant, and the D subjoined to the
N of the third person plural in the present tense is
wanting in the preterite; the modification already
induced in the verb itself, in the formation of the
preterite tense, being sufficient for distinguishing the
sense in conversation.[a]

In another part of his work the same writer
makes the following observations, with a view to
eucidate, as far as the languages within his scope
would afford opportunity, the origin of these in-
flections.

He says, " The personal characteristics in the
conjugation of verbs allow of a satisfactory compa-
rison with the personal pronouns, the relations of
which are blended in the idea of the verb. Some-
thing is really explained by this comparison. Some
parts of the personal pronoun destitute of gender
offer themselves in a striking manner; what is less
obvious we must endeavour to restore from the
corrupt state partly of the pronoun, and partly of
the verbal inflection, the variations of which have
been for an indefinite time increasing each in its
own way, without regard to the original connection

<hr />

[a] Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik. th. i. p. 835-6.

between them. Sometimes the forms of the pronoun[b] may be conjectured from the verb, and sometimes those of the verb from the pronoun ; the third person is for obvious reasons the most obscure, of which the pronoun destitute of gender has undergone the greatest change, has become defective in some cases, and in some instances has been entirely lost, while the pronoun of the third person having gender shows no relation to the verbal inflection. The characteristic terminations of the third person, singular and plural, viz. D, and ND, *appear to me quite inexplicable by means of the German pronouns.* The M of the first person singular is more tractable. From pentamês in the first person plural I infer a more ancient MEIS, instead of the Old High German VEIS, and trace from MEIS, MIS, WIS, WIR. The termination of the second person in TH is clearly related to the pronoun THU, and affords room for conjecturing an older, thjus (thyùs), instead of jus, for the second person plural. Lastly, the characteristic endings of the dual v and TS have a relation to the dual pronominal forms vit and jut (originally juts). The examination of foreign languages anciently connected will help to support these conjectures."[c]

I shall examine whether this subject will admit of further elucidation from the extant forms of the Celtic verbs and pronouns.

[b] The difficult anomalies of which are observed in page 813 of Grimm's Grammatik.

[c] Grimm, p. 1052.

SECTION V.

Of the Celtic pronouns.

The Celtic dialects, having no declension of the pronouns, properly so termed, supply the deficiency in a manner similar to that adopted in the Hebrew and other cognate languages. They have two series of personal pronouns, the distinct or entire pronouns, which are chiefly used as nominative cases, or as accusatives after verbs, and a class of abbreviated pronouns used in regimen particularly after prepositions, and answering the purpose of the oblique cases of pronouns in other languages. I shall first give a table of the entire pronouns, as they exist in both of the principal branches of the Celtic language.

PARAGRAPH 1.

Entire personal pronouns in the Erse.

The entire personal pronouns in the Erse are as follows :

First Person.

Me, I or me.

Sinn, we; inn, secondary form, the initial s being changed for н and at length omitted.[a]

Second Person.

Tu, thou ; thu, *i.e.* t'hu, secondary form.

Sibh, you ; ibh, secondary form.

---

[a] In chap. i. sec. i. the reader will find an explanation of what is meant by the secondary forms of initial consonants.

Third Person.
Singular Masculine.

Se, he ; e, secondary form.

Singular Feminine.

Si, she ; i, secondary form.

Plural Common.

Siad, they ; iad, secondary form.

PARAGRAPH 2.

Entire pronouns personal in Welsh.

First Person.

Mi, I ; reduplicate form, myvi, ἐγώγε; secondary form of initial, vi and i.

Ni, we ; reduplicate form, nyni.

Second Person.

Ti, thou ; reduplicate form, tydi, secondary form of initial, di and thi.

Chwi, you ; reduplicate form, chwychi.

Third Person.
Masculine Singular.

Ev, eve, evo, ve, vo, e, o.

All these various words occur for he and him.

Note. The Welsh translators of the Holy Scriptures considered *eve* as a nominative case preceding the verb, and they used ev for the accusative ; but in this they are said by the most learned of the Welsh grammarians to be in opposition as well to the common usage of the Welsh language as to the authority of the old poets.[b]

With more probability, eve and evo have been considered by grammarians as reduplicate forms, the simple pronoun being *ev*, or rather *e*. Analogy leads us to suppose that the original state

---

[b] Antiquæ Linguæ Britannicæ Rudimenta, auctore Joh. Davies. Editio altera, Oxonii, 1809, p. 84.

of this pronoun was in Welsh as it is in Erse, se, and, the initial being softened, he, which was afterwards written *e*.

Feminine Singular.

Hi, she ; reduplicated, hihi.

Note. The same rule of analogy above referred to proves that hi was derived from a primitive form si, whence hi, as in Erse.

Plural Common.

Hwy and hwynt ; reduplicate form, hwynt hwy.

Note. There is reason to suspect that hwy and hwynt were in like manner originally swy and swynt, though this ancient form is no longer extant even in Erse. But of this there is no proof, but that which is afforded by analogy.

Paragraph 3.

Pronouns in regimen or Pronominal Suffixes.

Such is the entire and proper form of the personal pronouns in the Celtic dialects, and they probably represent a very old or the primitive state of these parts of speech in the Indo-European languages. It may indeed in many instances be observed that the Celtic pronouns are the nominatives from which the oblique cases in those languages may be regularly formed ; whereas these cases, in several examples that might be adduced, have little or no affinity to the vocables which now stand to them in the relation of nominatives. The real nominatives appear to have been lost, and other words substituted in their places ; but in the Celtic, which has no declension of pronouns, the original forms, perhaps in consequence of this very circumstance, have been preserved.

But besides the series of forms above given, the pronouns in the Celtic language are also found in a state considerably modified by composition or construction with other words. The preceding are all separate and complete words by themselves; those to which I now allude are abbreviated, or modified and affected in orthography by the words which are immediately prefixed. I shall show this by examples, and take, in the first place, the pronouns as governed by and blended with some of the prepositions[c].

The following are the forms in which the personal pronouns appear when following the preposition *at*, to:—

mi or vi		av	as attav, to me.
ti or di		at	attat, to thee.
evo	is changed into	aw and / o	attaw / atto } to him.
hi		i	atti, to her.
ni		om	as attom, to us.
chwi	becomes	och	attoch, to you.
hwynt		ynt	attynt, to them.

The preposition *tan*, under, changes them in a similar manner, as—

1	tanav	tanom.
2	tanat	tanoch.
3	tano and tani	tanynt.

[c] In what remains to be said on the subject of the pronouns, I shall, to avoid perplexity, confine myself to the Welsh dialect of the Celtic, premising that in the Erse dialect very nearly the same facts are to be observed.

Rhwng, between, changes them as follows :

1	rhyng-*ov*	rhyng-om.
2	rhyng-*ot*	rhyng-och.
3 {	rhyng-*dho*	rhyng-dh-ynt or
	rhyng-*dhi*	rhyng-th-ynt.

Yn, in, changes them thus :

ynov, in me.   ynom, in us.
ynot, in thee.   ynoch, in you.
yntho, or } in him.
yndho,

ynthi, or } in her.
yndhi,

{ ynthynt, or
(yndhynt, in them.

Trwy, through, alters them thus :

trwyov,   trwyom.
trwyot,   trwyoch.
trwydho, }
trwydhi, }   trwydhynt.

Wrth, by, thus :

wrthyv,   wrthym.
wrthyt,   wrthych.
wrtho, }
wrthi, }   wrthynt.

The preceding are all very analogous, but another form occurs in the combination of the pronouns with the preposition i, to, of which it is important to take notice.

1. im' or ym', to me.   in' or yn', to us.
2. it' or yt' to thee.   iwch, to you.
3. idho, to him.   idhynt, to them.
   idhi, to her.

Nor are these mutations of the personal pronouns confined to the instance of their combinations with prepositions. They are thus compounded with the possessive pronoun or adjective eidho, own.

eidhov, my own.	eidhom, our own.
eidhot, thy own.	eidhoch, your own,
eidho, his own.	eidhont ⎫
eidhi, her own.	eidhynt ⎬ their own.

The Welsh grammarians deduce analytically the following series of forms under which the personal pronouns occur when thus modified by the preceding words.

mi		av, ov, yv, or m'.
ti		at, ot, yt, or t'.
evo		aw, o, or dho.
hi	becomes	i or dhi.
ni		om, ym, or n'.
chwi		och, ych, or ch.
hwynt		ynt, sometimes dhynt.

The reader can hardly fail to be struck with the very obvious relation which discovers itself between this series of pronouns and the personal endings of the Welsh verbs, of which the different forms were given in the preceding chapter. The comparison of the two tables will at once prove that the terminations of the verbs are in fact a series of pronominal suffixes, and the problem which regards the origin of these personal inflections may be considered as solved, in so far as it regards the Welsh and the other dialects of the Celtic language. There is in-

deed in Welsh a considerable variety in the personal
terminations of the verbs, and this may be supposed
with probability to have been a consequence of the
poverty of the Celtic language in respect to the
conjugations in temporal and modal inflections, or in
those changes by which the differences of mood and
tense are indicated. In these modifications the
Celtic has fewer resources than many other lan-
guages; and it was probably found necessary to
supply the deficiency by a considerable variety in
the personal endings, which in some measure help
to characterise the tenses. There is not, however,
in these a greater diversity than among the abbre-
viated pronouns, and nearly all the verbal termina-
tions are to be found in the preceding table. This
I shall now shew by a comparison of the verbal
endings with the pronouns.

Paragraph 4.

*Comparison of the personal endings of verbs with the
contracted forms of the pronouns.*

It may be remembered that in a former section
the personal endings of the verbs in the Welsh lan-
guage were said to be reducible for the most part to
four, or rather three principal forms. These are as
follows :

First form.	Second form.	Third form.
SING.	SING.	SING.
1. -av	-ais	-wn
2. -i	-aist	-it
3. root simply	-odh	-ai.

PLUR.	PLUR.	PLUR.
1. -wn	-om	-em or -ym
2. -wch	-och	-ech or -ych
3. -ant	-ont	-ent or -ynt.

If the reader will only compare this table with that of abbreviated pronouns contained in the end of the last paragraph, he will perceive at once their relation.

The plural terminations are precisely the pronouns. The first set presents the greatest variety, but even these are traced among the pronouns; in' or yn' and iwch, being the forms which the pronouns ni and chwi assume after the proposition i. The first of these, in' or yn', seems a more natural change of ni, than the more usual om or ym, which is so remote from ni as to give rise to suspicion that the Welsh language had once a pronoun resembling the ἄμε or ἄμες of the Greeks, and that this has been lost, notwithstanding the permanent character of the Celtic dialects.

The personal endings in the singular number are more various, but they are still analogous to the abbreviated pronouns. In the first form, for example, which is that of the future or present tense, the first person has the ending in *av*, which the pronoun mi or vi generally assumes in regimen, as above shewn. The ais of the second form is not pronominal, but an inflection characteristic of the tense, the syllable *ais* or *as* being introduced in the past tenses of the Celtic verb, nearly as the *od* or *ed* in the Teutonic

conjugations; it is brought in before the pronominal
termination, as in the plurals carasom, carasoch,
carasant. The second person, in two out of the
three forms, has the abbreviated pronoun as a suffix,
either in *it* or *t*. In the first form, the ending *i*,
though it does not appear among the abbreviated
pronouns, is the termination of the separate pronoun
of the second person ; and this is therefore probably
a suffix. The third person is differently constituted.
In the first form of the verb, as in carav, ceri, câr,
from the word caru to love, or in bydhav, bydhi,
bŷdh, from the verb substantive, the third person is
merely the verbal root used, as in the Semitic lan-
guages, without any suffix. In the third form ai
was perhaps ae, and derived from eve, or its modi-
fication as used in regimen é. The ending in *odh*
seems anomalous in the Welsh language, though it
nearly resembles the termination of the third person
in other idioms, as the Teutonic *aith* or *ot*.[d] The
Welsh suffix, if formed regularly from the pronoun,
would be in o or aw ; and this actually occurs in the
future tense of the subjunctive mood, which does
not fall under either of the forms above stated, but
has the singular number thus :

1. bydhwyv,   2. bydhych,   3. bydho.

PARAGRAPH 5.

General result in respect to the Celtic verbs.

On a review of this analysis it appears clearly
that the Welsh verbal terminations are in general

---

[d] Is it the abbreviated form of the pronoun (dho) reversed?

merely abbreviated or modified pronouns, affixed to the verbal roots; and this conclusion does not rest merely upon a probable conjecture, on which the grammarians of other Indo-European languages have been obliged to found it, but on the more substantial fact, that the very terminations in question are actually to be identified with the pronouns as they are used on other occasions in an abbreviated form.

SECTION VI.

Conclusions respecting the personal inflections of verbs in the other Indo-European languages.

As it has been, I trust, satisfactorily proved that the inflection of verbs in the Welsh language consists in the addition of pronominal suffixes to the verbal roots, and as in a former section sufficient evidence appeared, of the affinity and original sameness of the verbal inflections in all these languages, we are entitled to infer without hesitation, that in the other languages which belong to this stock, the verbs are inflected on the same principle, and that, although in many instances they are no longer extant, pronouns formerly existed in all these idioms more or less analogous to the Welsh pronouns.

It will be worth while to go a little more minutely into this consideration.

1. The pronoun of the third person plural in Welsh is hwynt in the entire form, and ynt in the

contracted one, which, as a verbal suffix, is ynt, ent, ont, ant.   In the other languages the terminations of the verb are as follows :

In Greek,   οντι, εντι, αν, οντο, κ.τ.λ.
In Sanskrit,   anti, antu, an.
In Latin,   ant, ent, unt, anto, ento, etc.
In Teutonic,   and, aina, ont, ant, on, etc.

These languages have no personal pronoun now extant similar to hwynt or ynt ; but, from the considerations above adverted to, it is probable that such a pronoun existed in them.

2. The Welsh separate pronoun of the first person plural is ni, which is to be recognised in other languages in the oblique, if not in the nominative cases.[a]   The contracted form of this pronoun in n' enters into some of the Welsh tenses as a suffix, but most of them have the other Welsh pronoun of this person, *om* or *ym*. This, as we have observed, can scarcely be derived from ni, but rather comes from some separate pronoun originally common to all these languages, which must have been analogous to the Greek ἅμε or ἅμες, or perhaps a plural formed from the nominative singular mi. However this may have been, the termination, am, em, ym is really a contracted pronoun in the Welsh

---

[a] Viz. in Sanskrit,   नौ nau.
        in Greek,   νῶϊ.
        in Latin,   nos.
        in Russian,   nas.

language, and must have existed as such in the cognate idioms. The following endings may therefore be regarded as pronominal suffixes :

In Greek, αμες, ομες.
In Sanskrit, āmah, or āmas, ma.
In Latin, amus, emus, imus, umus.
In Teutonic, ames, omes, aima, am.

3. The separate pronoun of the second person plural in Welsh is chwi, and the abbreviated one och or ych, which, as we have seen, is also the suffix in the endings of verbs for this person. All the other Indo-European languages have a dental consonant in the place of the Welsh guttural or palatine letter, as in the

Teutonic dialects, aith, ith, uth, ot, et.
In Sanskrit, ātha, tha, or ta.
In Greek, ατε, ετε, τε.
In Latin, atis, ate, etis, ete, itis, ite.

What the separate pronoun was in these languages from which the termination of the verb is contracted, we can scarcely hope to discover; but the fact being proved that the Celtic verb is here formed by means of a pronominal suffix, we may infer from analogy that the same construction holds in the other languages.

4. We have seen that the separate pronoun of the first person singular in Welsh is mi or vi, and the constructive pronoun av, ov, yv, or m'. The

verbal suffix is av or yv : in the Erse dialect it is am, aim, or im.   In most other languages m is the characteristic consonant of this person, with or without a subsequent vowel, as,

In Greek,   μι, as εἰμὶ, τίθημι.
In Sanskrit, mi, or m, as bhavāmi, abhavishyam.
In Latin,   m, as inquam, sum, amabam.

Although the pronouns extant in these languages do not come so near to the above terminations as the Welsh mi, vi, and m', still they may account for it tolerably well.

In Greek and in Latin, the ἐγω or ego probably gave rise to the ending of verbs in o, which is perhaps a later form than the termination in mi.[b]

In other instances the first person singular has no addition to the simple verb, or to the common characteristic of the tense.   The verb was used in this state either with the separate pronoun or without any.   The other persons are marked by characteristic additions, and it was sufficient for the first to be without any suffix.   But while the Teutonic dialects have the first person in this state, the Celtic dialects, like the Semitic languages, have the third person most frequently in the simple state, or in that which is nearest to the verbal root.

---

[b] This is contrary to the opinion of some eminent grammarians, who regard the form in μι as more recent than that in o.   Before this opinion can be allowed to be probable, some answer must be given to the question, How it can have happened that the newer forms in the Greek language should resemble those of the Sanskrit so much more than the older ones, as they would do on the hypothesis?

5. The second and third persons singular end as follows :

	SECOND PERSON.	THIRD PERSON.
Greek,	σι or ς,	τι, το, or ει.
Sanskrit,	si or s,	ti, or t.
Latin,	s.	t.
Teutonic,	ais, is, es,	eith, eth, t.

Here there seems to be, at the first view of the subject, an interchange of pronouns; for the pronoun of the second person, in its usual state, was in all these languages nearly the same as in Welsh. It was τύ, tu, twam (*i.e.* radically tu), thu, in Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, and Gothic respectively: and the pronoun of the third person is sah, and sa in Sanskrit and Gothic. But we may observe in the first place that the original form of the third person was in all these languages tŏ, tăh, te, or at least a *t* with a vowel adjoined. This is indicated by the analogy of the neuter gender and the oblique cases. The Greek was originally—

	τὸς,	τὰ,	τό.
The Latin with *is* prefixed (?)	te,	ta,	tud.
The Sanskrit,	tas or tah,	tā,	tat, or tad.
The Gothic,	tha,	tho,	tha, or thata.

A modification of these pronouns, according to the rule adopted in the other persons, would produce the endings of verbs in the third person singular exactly as they are above laid down.

In those instances in which the third person of the verb has an ending in a vowel, we may account for the peculiarity by supposing, either that the suffix has been omitted, as it was above shown to be in some languages, or that a contracted pronoun, akin to the e of the Welsh or the ἕ of the Greek language, has been used.

The personal pronouns of the second and third persons are so nearly alike, that it was found necessary to distinguish the verb connected with each by some discriminating mark; and this was easily done by taking a form of one personal pronoun, which was perhaps originally only a dialectic difference, but in which the sibilant consonant is substituted for a dental one.   It is well known that ς and τ are easily interchanged, as when the Greek σσ is transmuted into ττ, and in the present instance τυ has been actually changed for σύ. There being two forms of the pronoun, a sibilant and a dental one, the former was preferred for the characteristic of the second person in those instances in which the dental had been appropriated to the third person.

We shall endeavour in the sequel to make some of these remarks more certain and explicit, by an examination of particular tenses and a comparison of the different forms of verbs in the several languages of the same stock.[14]

NOTE ON SECTION VI., AND THE CHAPTER IN GENERAL.

(14). *Doctrine respecting the origin of the persons of verbs.*—
The writer in this country who first gave due prominence to the
doctrine respecting the origin of the personal endings of the
Keltic and other verbs, was the late Mr. Garnett. *Inter alia*, as
a matter of philological history, he pointed out a passage in the
writings of that excellent, but under-valued, archæologist,
Lhuyd, adding, however, that Dr. Prichard did not seem to
be aware of it—as was doubtless the case. No man was more
incapable of appropriating the discovery of a predecessor. The
passage, however, of Lhuyd, as given by Mr. Garnett, is as
follows :—" We may observe that the verbs have derived their
distinction of persons originally from the pronouns, in regard we
find yet some footsteps of them in their termination. For the
last letter in Guelav [I see] is taken from *vi*, I ; the last of
Guelon [we see], from *ni*, we ; of Guelock and Gueloh [ye see],
from *chui* and *hui*, ye ; and in Guelanz, the third person plural,
the pronoun [which] is almost wholly retained for *anz, onz*, or
oinz, is but the same with our Welsh *uynt* or *huint*, they." Of
paramount importance, however, was Mr. Garnett's own modifi-
cation of the theory. In a contribution to the ' Quarterly Review'
for Christmas, A.D. 1836, (vol. lvii., pp. 93, 94), he writes as
follows :—" We have a statement of Lhuyd, making a perfectly
analogous one with respect to the personal terminations of the
verb in Welsh, in his well-known work, ' The Eastern Origin of
the Celtic Nations.' Both those eminent scholars refer those
terminations to the ordinary nominatives of the personal pro-
nouns, of which they consider them to be abbreviated forms. As
far back as A.D. 1836, the writer believed that he saw reason to
allege strong objections to this view of the matter, which he ex-
pressed in the following terms in a critique on Dr. Prichard's
work :—'We have observed that Dr. Prichard's statements re-
specting the Celtic languages throw a new and important light
on the formation of language ; and this we hold to be particularly
the case with respect to the verb. He has shown that the per-
sonal terminations in Welsh are pronouns, and that they are more
clearly and unequivocally so than the corresponding endings in
Sanskrit or its immediate descendants. However, he lays no

stress upon a fact which we cannot but consider highly import-
ant, viz. that they are evidently *in statu regiminis*, not in appo-
sition or concord: in other words, they are not nominatives, but
oblique cases, precisely such as are affixed to various prepositions.
For example, the second person plural does not end with the
nominative *chwi*, but with *ech, wch, och, ych*, which last three
forms are also found coalescing with various prepositions—*iwch*,
to you; *ynoch*, in you ; *wrthych*, through you. Now the roots of
Welsh verbs are confessedly nouns, generally of abstract signifi-
cation : ex. gr. *dysg* is both *doctrina* and the 2nd pers. impera-
tive, *doce ; dysg-och* or *-wch* is not, therefore, *docetis* or *docebitis
vos ;* but *doctrina vestrûm*, teaching *of* or *by* you. This leads
to the important conclusion that a verb is nothing but a *noun*,
combined with an *oblique case* of a personal pronoun, virtually in-
cluding in it a connecting *preposition*. This is what constitutes
the real *copula* between the subject and the attribute. *Doctrina
ego* is a logical absurdity; but *doctrina mei*, teaching *of* me,
necessarily includes in it the proposition *ego doceo*, enunciated in
a strictly logical and unequivocal form.' "

The doctrine, then, as it now stands, is that the personal
terminations of the verbs are not only pronouns, but pronouns in
the oblique case—a doctrine of which full exposition is to be
found in a series of papers in the earlier volumes of the 'Trans-
actions of the Philological Society,' of unsurpassed, and, per-
haps, unrivalled merit,—eminent in respect to the great width of
the induction upon which the result rests, and eminent for the ex-
tent to which the method is favorably contrasted with the ordinary
à priori mode of treating philological questions.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the Inflection of Verbs through Tenses and Moods.

SECTION I.

General view of the subject.

THE observations comprised in the two last chapters relate merely to the personal endings of verbs, or to those inflections which serve to distinguish their different persons and numbers. The modifying principles, on which depends the discrimination of moods and tenses, yet remain to be analyzed and compared. These are two distinct subjects of inquiry. I have been induced to enter into the former at some length for two reasons. The principal of these is, the convincing proof which the inflections already surveyed appear to furnish of a deeply-rooted affinity between the Celtic dialects and the other languages of Europe and Asia which have been compared with them. Another motive has been the hope of throwing some light on the grammatical principles governing the inflection of verbs in all these idioms. How far this attempt has been successful my readers must judge. I ought now to proceed to the more arduous task of examining the structure of verbs through their different moods and

tenses, and of tracing the relations which the latter
bear to each other in different languages.   But this
endeavour is in the outset obstructed by the great,
and, I fear, as yet hardly surmountable difficulties.
The structure of the Teutonic languages, and the
analogies of these to the Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit,
have already occupied the attention of several ac-
curate and ingenious writers, who have been men-
tioned in the preceding pages; but the Celtic
dialects may be said to furnish a new and almost
unexplored field.   The attempts which have been
made to elucidate their etymology have been, with
very few exceptions, remarkably unsuccessful; and it
will perhaps be long before any person, possessed of
the requisite opportunities for performing this task
in the best manner, may be found ready to under-
take it.   In this deficiency of materials, and in the
want of any correct arrangement of such as exist,
I am aware that I enter upon the remainder of my
inquiry under very unfavorable circumstances.   I
am quite unable to proceed in the investigation of
the Celtic language and its affinities with that ac-
curacy and lucid analysis, which Professors Bopp
and Grimm have applied to the idioms which they
have examined and compared.   Perhaps, indeed, the
subject itself does not admit of such illustration.   I
expect, however, to furnish proofs which shall be
deemed a sufficient groundwork for the inferences to
be founded upon them.

    I shall enter upon this part of my subject, as in

the former instance, by examining the particular features in other idioms, which I mean afterwards to compare with those of the Celtic dialects.

SECTION II.

Modifications of Verbs common to the Sanskrit and Greek.

The most striking and extensive marks of relationship are to be traced between the Sanskrit conjugations of verbs and the Latin and Greek, but particularly between the Sanskrit verbs and the Greek verbs in μι. The Sanskrit verbs may indeed be said to be governed by the same laws of conjugation as the latter. But, in making this remark, we must distinguish three series or different sets of Greek verbs in μι, and allow the two former to constitute in some respects an exception to this analogy, though in another point of view they will be found to confirm it. The first are those verbs which, besides the characteristic endings of this conjugation, have also a reduplication of the first syllable, or an addition which is a substitute for one, as the verbs τίθημι, δίδωμι, and ἵστημι. There are verbs in Sanskrit which have a similar reduplication: it is not, however, a general character, but the mark of a particular conjugation, which ranks as the third in the series of ten classes. Verbs of the third con-

jugation reduplicate the first consonant, or make some equivalent prefix. Thus from the verbal root dā, *to give*, comes the verb dadāmi, dadasi, dadati, answering to δίδωμι, δίδως, δίδωσι or δίδωτι, which prefixes this reduplication through the four first tenses formed like the first three in Greek from the present tense, but has no remarkable peculiarity in other parts of the verb. Many other Sanskrit verbs, which do not belong to the third conjugation, undergo a modification not unlike that of the root of ἵστημι. Thus from the root छ्ट shthā, to stand, comes the present tense tishthāmi, tishthasi, tishthati. A second class of Greek verbs in μι insert the syllable νυ between the verbal root and the personal endings, as the verb ζεύγ-νυ-μι. There is likewise a particular class of Sanskrit verbs analogous to these, and having the same distinction, which is considered as the character of the fifth conjugation : but these are, as in Greek, a comparatively small number of verbs. Those Greek verbs in μι, however, which bear the nearest resemblance to the generality of Sanskrit verbs, are such as make no prefix to the initial of the root, nor any insertion, but merely add the personal termination. Among these we reckon φημὶ, dico ; ἵστημι, scio ; εἰμὶ, sum ; and εἶμι, vado. Some of the same class are obsolete in the present tense, and only used in the aorist, as βῆμι, proficiscor, and γήρημι, senesco ; and this last may be compared to the Sanskrit verb jarāmi, of the same meaning.

	SANSKRIT.	GREEK.	DORIC FORMS.
Sing.	jarāmi	γήρημι	
	jarasi	γήρης	
	jarati	γήρησι	γήρατι.
Dual	jarāvas		
	jarathas	γήρατον	
	jaratas	γήρατον	
Plural	jarāmas	γήραμεν	γήραμες (?)
	jaratha	γήρατε	
	jaranti	γηρᾶσι	γήραντι.

Of the Præterita Augmentata, or Preterimperfect Tense and Aorists.

There are two preterite tenses in Sanskrit verbs, which are deserving of particular notice, as they are formed in a manner very similar to that of two tenses of the Greek verb. One of them is analogous to the imperfect, and the other to the aorists; and there is no reason that forbids their being distinguished by these terms.

1. The imperfect is formed from the present tense by prefixing an augment, and abbreviating the personal endings. The augment is the first short vowel ऄ a, which, corresponding with the short vowels of the Greeks, might be represented indifferently by ἀ or ἐ. Thus are formed from

tudāmi		atudam
tudasi	———	atudas
tudati		atudat.

2. The aorist has three, or rather, according to Professor Bopp's division, seven forms. Of these it

is observed, that the four first agree more or less closely with the Greek first aorist, the fifth and sixth with the second aorist, and the seventh, which, besides an augment, admits a reduplication of the first syllable, with the preterpluperfect. Thus in the four first some make this tense by inserting s, or the syllable is, or sa, or sas, between the root and the personal endings, and by prefixing the augment to the root, the vowel of which undergoes a change by the forms guna and vriddhi. The root kship, present tense kshipāmi, makes the aorist akshepam. This is one of the examples given by Bopp, and the analogy is more striking, if the words are written as the Greeks would have written them, thus :

ROOT	PRESENT TENSE.	AORIST.
ξίπ,	ξίπαμι,	ἔξοιψαμ,

The two succeeding forms of the aorist differ from the imperfect tense very nearly in the same manner in which the second aorist in Greek differs from the Greek imperfect.

We shall find the insertion of s, sa, or as, to be a method used in other instances for the formation of tenses with a past signification.[15]

NOTE ON SECTION II.

(15). *On the s of the Greek aorist.* —The following is the reprint of a paper published by the editor in the 'Transactions of the Philological Society' (read March 11, 1853). It takes an exception to a *portion* of the doctrine of Bopp, in respect to the

origin of the *s* in the first aorist. It is headed—'On the Aorists in *-κα*.'

"A well-known rule in the Eton Greek Grammar may serve to introduce the subject of the present remarks :—' Quinque sunt aoristi primi qui futuri primi characteristicam non assumunt: ἔθηκα *posui*, ἔδωκα *dedi*, ἧκα *misi*, εἶπα *dixi*, ἤνεγκα *tuli*.' The absolute accuracy of this sentence is no part of our considerations : it has merely been quoted for the sake of illustration.

" What is the import of this abnormal *κ*? or, changing the expression, what is the explanation of the aorist in *-κα*? Is it certain that it *is* an aorist? or, granting this, is it certain that its relations to the future are exceptional?

" The present writer was at one time inclined to the doubts implied by the first of these alternatives, and gave some reasons [a] for making the form a *perfect* rather than an aorist. He finds, however, that this is only shifting the difficulty. How do *perfects* come to end in *-κα*? The typical and unequivocal perfects are formed by a reduplication at the beginning, and a modification of the final radical consonant at the end, of words, τύπ (τ) ω, τέ-τυφ-α ; and this is the origin of the χ in λέλεχα, etc., which represents the γ of the root. Hence, even if we allow ourselves to put the *κ* in ἔθηκα in the same category with the *κ* in ὀμώμοκα, etc., we are as far as ever from the true origin of the form.

" In this same category, however, the two words—and the classes they represent—*can* be placed, notwithstanding some small difficulties of detail. At any rate, it is easier to refer ὀμώμοκα and ἔθηκα to the same tense, than it is to do so with ὀμώμοκα and τέτυφα.

" The next step is to be sought in Bopp's Comparative Grammar. Here we find the following extract :—' The old Slavonic *dakh*, ' I gave,' and analogous formations remind us, through their guttural, which *takes the place of a sibilant*, of the Greek aorists ἔθηκα, ἔδωκα, ἧκα. That which in the old Slavonic has become a rule in the first person of the three numbers, viz. the *gutturalization of an original s*, may have occasionally taken place in the Greek, but carried throughout all numbers. No conjecture lies closer at hand than that of regarding ἔδωκα *as a corruption of* ἔδωσα,' etc. . . . . . . ' The Lithuanian also presents a form which is akin to the Greek and Sanscrit aorist, in which, as it

[a] English Language, p. 489.

appears to me, k *assumes the place of an original* s,' (vol. ii.
p. 791, Eastwick's translation.)   The italics indicate the words
that most demand attention.

" The old Slavonic inflection alluded to is as follows :—

SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
1. Nes-*och*	Nes-*ochowa*	Nes-*ochom*.
2. Nes-*e*	Nes-*osta*	Nes-*oste*.
3. Nes-*e*	Nes-*osta*	Nes-*osza*.

" Now it is clear that the doctrine to which these extracts
commit the author is that of the secondary or derivative cha-
racter of the form of κ, and the primary or fundamental cha-
racter of the forms in σ. The former is deduced from the latter.
And this is the doctrine which the present writer would reverse.
He would just reverse it, agreeing with the distinguished scholar
whom he quotes, in the identification of the Greek form with the
Slavonic.   So much more common is the change from k, g, and
the allied sounds, to s, z, etc., than that from s, z, etc. to k, g,
that the *à priori* probabilities are strongly against Bopp's view.
Again, the languages that pre-eminently encourage the change
are the Slavonic ; yet it is just in these languages that the form
in k is assumed to be secondary.   For s to become h, and for h to
become k (or g), is no improbable change : still, as compared
with the transition from k to s, it is exceedingly rare.

" As few writers are better aware of the phenomena connected
with the direction of letter-changes than the philologist before us,
it may be worth while to ask, why he has ignored them in the
present instances.   He has probably done so because the Sanskrit
forms were in s ; the habit of considering whatever is the more
Sanskritic of two forms to be the older being well-nigh universal.
Nevertheless, the difference between a language which is old
because it is represented by old samples of its literature, and a
language which is old because it contains primary forms, is
manifest upon a very little reflection.   The positive argument,
however, in favour of the k being the older form, lies in the
well-known phenomenon connected with the vowels e and i, as
opposed to a, o, and u.   All the world over, e and i have a
tendency to convert a k or g, when it precedes them, into s, z, sh,
zh, ksh, gzh, tsh, and dzh, or some similar sibilant.   Hence, as
often as a sign of tense, consisting of k, is followed by a sign of
person, beginning with e or i, an s has a chance of being evolved.

In this case such a form as $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon$, may have originally run $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\kappa\epsilon$. The modified form in σ afterwards extends itself to the other persons and numbers. Such is the illustration of the hypothesis. An objection against it lies in the fact of the person which ends in a small vowel, being only one out of seven. On the other hand, however, the third person singular is used more than all the others put together. With this influence of the small vowel other causes may have cooperated. Thus, when the root ended in κ or γ, the combination κ *radical*, and κ *inflectional* would be awkward. It would give us such words as $\ddot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa$-$\kappa\alpha$, etc.; words like $\tau\dot{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\pi$-$\kappa\alpha$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi$-$\kappa\alpha$, being but little better, at least in a language like the Greek.

" The suggestions that now follow lead into a wide field of inquiry; and they may be considered, either on their merits as part of a separate question, or as part of the proof of the present doctrine. In this latter respect they are not altogether essential, *i.e.* they are more confirmatory if admitted, than derogatory if denied. What if the future be derived from the aorist, instead of the aorist from the future? In this case we should increase what may be called our *dynamics*, by increasing the points of contact between a k and a small vowel; this being the influence that determines the evolution of an s. All the persons of the future, except the first, have ϵ for one (at least) of these vowels—

$$\tau\dot{\upsilon}\psi\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\omega, \quad \tau\dot{\upsilon}\psi\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\epsilon\iota\varsigma, \quad \tau\dot{\upsilon}\psi\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\epsilon\iota, \quad \tau\dot{\upsilon}\psi\text{-}\epsilon\text{-}\tau o\nu, \text{ etc.}$$

The moods are equally efficient in the supply of small vowels.

" The doctrine, then, now stands that k is the older form, but that, through the influence of third persons singular, future forms, and conjunctive forms, so many s-es became developed, as to supersede it except in a few instances. The Latin language favours this view. There, the old future like *cap-s-o*, and the preterites like *vixi* (*vic-si*) exhibit a small vowel in *all* their persons, *e.g.* *vic-s-i*, *vic-s-isti*, *vic-s-it*, etc. Still the doctrine respecting this influence of the small vowel in the way of the development of sibilants out of gutturals is defective until we find a real instance of the change assumed. As if for the very purpose of illustrating the occasional value of obscure dialects, the interesting language of the Serbs of Lusatia and Cotbus supplies one. Here the form of the preterite is as follows, the Serb of Illyria and the Lithuanic being placed in juxtaposition

and contrast with the Serb of Lusatia. Where a *small* vowel follows the characteristic of the tense, the sound is that of *sz*; in other cases it is that of *ch* (*kh*).

		LAUS.-SERB.	SERB. ILLYR.	LITHUANIC.	LETTISH.
Sing.	1.	noszach ...	*d*oneso, donije.........	nesziau..	nessu.
	2.	noszesze...	*d*onese, donije.........	nesziei...	nessi.
	3.	noszesze...	*d*onese, donije.........	nesziei...	nesse.
Dual	1.	noszachwe	....	nesziewa	
	2.	noszestaj..	....	neszieta.	
	3.	noszestaj..	....	neszie ...	
Plur.	1.	noszachmy	*d*onesosmo, donijesmo	neszieme	nessam.
	2.	noszes'c'e..	*d*onesoste, donijeste ..	nesziete.	nessat.
	3.	noszachu..	*d*onesosze, donijesze ..	neszie...	nesse."

SECTION III.

Forms common to Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit.

The preceding modifications of the verb are peculiar to the Sanskrit and Greek languages. The Latin has an imperfect resembling the Greek in meaning, though formed by a totally different mode of inflection, but it has nothing analogous to the aorist.[16] All these three languages agree in the circumstance, that they frequently modify the present tense by an insertion of particular consonants between the verbal root and the personal endings, which consonants are dropped in the further conjugation of the verb. Such are the ισκ, or isc, in such verbs as ἀναλίσκω and frigesco, the αν, in αἰσθάνομαι, ἁμαρτάνω, and the numerous verbs resembling them, which are analogous to the verbs of the ninth conjugation in Sanskrit: the latter insert na between

the root and the termination in the present tense.[a] These insertions are retained only in those tenses derived immediately from the present, as the imperfect is in Latin and Greek : they are dropped in the preterperfect and other forms of the verb.

The Teutonic language wants all these and many other variations : it has no tense formed by a modification of the present. "The capability of flection in the German verbs seems," says Professor Grimm, "to have been greatly impaired. Of the passive voice the last remains disappear with the Mœso-Gothic : the middle voice is everywhere wanting, with the exception of a reflected form in the old northern dialect, which is in some degree analogous to a middle voice. Four moods exist ; the infinitive, imperative, indicative, conjunctive, but there is no optative. What is most to be regretted is the loss of many tenses : only a present tense and a preterite remain to us : the future, and all the different degrees of the past signification, can no longer be expressed by a change in the form of the verb itself."[b]

NOTE ON SECTION III.

(16). *The Latin language has nothing analogous to the aorist.*— Exceptions to the doctrine here exhibited are taken by the editor in his English Language. Part iv. chap. xxvi. In Latin, forms like *cucurri* and *vixi* (*vic-si*) are both looked upon as perfects. One, however, is (if tested by its form) a perfect like τέτυφα, the other an aorist, like ἔτυψα, only under a different name.

---

[a] As krīnāmi, krīnāsi, etc. from the root krī, pret. chi-krá-ya.
[b] Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik. Theil. i.

SECTION IV.

Formation of the preterperfect in Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, and Teutonic verbs.

The preterperfect seems originally to have been formed on the same principle in the Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and Teutonic languages. Many changes in the forms of verbs have been produced by the addition of auxiliaries, or of particles inserted in or added to the root; but the preterperfect, in that method of conjugation which appears to have been the primitive one, is an inflection properly so termed. A partial repetition of the verbal root itself seems to have been originally adopted to denote a past signification, implying the act to have been done and completed.

PARAGRAPH 1.

Preterite in Teutonic Verbs.

The preterite of the strongly inflected conjugation, says Dr. Grimm, " must be considered as a chief beauty of our language, as a character intimately connected with its antiquity and its whole constitution. Independently of the inflection in the endings, of which the nature has already been pointed out, it affects the roots themselves, and that in a double manner; either the beginning of the root is repeated before itself, or the vowel of the root, whether initial or medial, is modified. The Gothic language

yet retains both methods; it reduplicates and modi-
fies: sometimes it applies both methods at once.
Reduplication never affects the terminating conso-
nants of the root. In the other Teutonic dialects
reduplication disappears, if we except slight traces,
and instead of it an unorganized diphthong has
been formed, the doubling of the consonant being
no more thought of.

The reduplicating conjugation leaves the vowel
sound of the root unaltered, and only puts the
doubled syllable before the singular and plural of
the preterite both indicative and conjunctive, but
not before the participle. The modifying conjuga-
tion never leaves the vowel of the present tense
unaltered in the preterite. On this principal are
formed six reduplicating conjugations, and six of
the latter description." I must refer the reader for
further particulars to Dr. Grimm's work, and shall
here give merely an example of each of these twelve
conjugations, all belonging to the strong or primitive
Gothic inflection. Under each verb are inserted
the present indicative, the preterite first person
singular and first person plural, and the participle.

1. Conjugation. Salta, salio, I leap.
   Salta; pret. sáisalt, sáisaltum; saltans.
2. Máita; abscido, I cut.
   Máita; pret. máimáit, máimáitum; maitans.
3. Hláupa; curro, I run.
   Hláupa; pret. hláihlaup, hláihlaupum; hlaupans.

4. Slêpa, dormio, I sleep.
  Slêpa ; pret. sáislêp, sáislêpum ; slêpans.
5. Laia, irrideo, I laugh.
  Láia ; pret. láilô, lailôum ; láians.
6. Grêta, ploro, I weep or grete, Scottish.
  Grêta ; pret. gáigrôt, gáigrôtum ; grêtans.
    Sixth Conjugation without reduplication.
7. Svara, juro, I swear.
  Svara ; pret. svôr, svôrum ; svarans.
8. Skeina, luceo, I shine.
  Skeina ; pret. skain, skinum ; skinans.
9. Liuga, mentior, I lie.
  Liuga ; pret. láug, lugum ; lugans.
10. Giba, do, I give.
  Giba ; pret. gab, gêbum ; gibans.
11. Stila, furor, I steal.
  Stila ; pret. stal, stêlum ; stalans.
12. Hilpa, adjuvo, I help.
  Hilpa ; pret. halp, hulpum ; hulpans.

I have taken these examples in full, because the analogies which they display to the forms of our tongue are interesting to English readers. The Mœso-Gothic is far more perfect in its inflections than any other language of the same stock. In the later dialects they gradually fade away, but still the remains are reducible to the same system.

The weaker form of verbal inflections is, according to Grimm, modern in comparison of the stronger form. For the grounds of this opinion I must refer

the reader to his work.[a]   The preterite is formed
by the insertion of a syllable of which *d* is the con-
sonant, and this is regarded by Grimm as an abbre-
viated auxiliary, derived from the verb to *do*, which
in the Old High German is *tuon*.   Thus sókida, I
sought, is I "seek—did."   The inflections of this
verb *tuon* are very distinct in the Old High German
and appear to give some probability to Dr. Grimm's
conjecture [17] as to the origin of the preterperfect
tense, in the form which has become most frequently
used in the modern German and English languages.[b]

NOTE ON PARAGRAPH 1.

(17).   *Grimm's conjecture that sokida = I seek—did.*—The text
scarcely puts Grimm's doctrine in its true view; according to
which *did* is formed from *do* by reduplication, then placed *after*
the verb (to which it gives a past power), then incorporated with
it as an inseparable affix, and then acted upon by certain euphonic
processes, which eliminate one of the *d*s.   Yet this statement
scarcely does justice to the hypothesis; inasmuch as the text of
Grimm gives us certain forms wherein we find a second *d*.
The *Mœso-Gothic plural preterite* ends in -*dedum*; *e. g. nas-i-
déd-um nas-i-déd-uth, nas-i-déd-un* from *nas-ja*, and, similarly,
sók-i-déd-um, etc., and *salb-ó-déd-um*, etc. from *sók-ja* and *sal-bó.*
The same takes place in the *dual* forms, as, *salb-ó-déd-uts*, etc.

Without going further than a mere suspension of judgement
as to the accuracy of this derivation, I have suggested (Eng-
lish Language, part iv., chap. xxxii.) the possibility of the *d* of
the past tense being the *d* of the participle, that being the *t* in
words like *voc-a-t-us*, and the *θ* in words like *τυφ-θ-εις*.

---

[a] Deutsche Grammatik : th. i., p. 1040.
[b] See p. 885, 1039, 1042, of Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik.

PARAGRAPH 2.

Preterperfect tense in Greek and Sanskrit.

The formation of the preterfect tense in Greek and in Sanskrit is on principles so similar, that it requires more care to sum up the points in which they differ than those in which they agree. In both, the root, which frequently consists of one syllable, is preserved nearly in its entire state, with a final short vowel added to it, and a short syllable gene- rally prefixed, which is termed the reduplication. In Greek the vowel of the reduplication is always ε, but in Sanskrit the vowel is the short one corresponding with that of the verbal root : thus from the root तुप् *τυπ*, which forms a verb of nearly the same meaning in Greek and in Sanskrit, the preterite is in one language *τέτυπα*, and in the other tutopa. The reduplicated consonant in Greek is a tenuis, and in Sanskrit the tenuis or media, when the root begins with an aspirate, and when double consonants are the initials, the first is alone reduplicated. In this last case the two languages just mentioned have consulted euphony more than either the Latin or Teutonic, both of which repeat the double con- sonants. The principal vowel of the root under- goes a change in the preterperfect, which in Sanskrit is termed guna and vriddhi. This is analogous to the corresponding change in the Greek old preter- perfect, in such forms as *μέμονα* and *οἶδα*, and to the

changes above alluded to in the Teutonic and Latin preterites.

The following words will serve to exemplify this form of Sanskrit verbs :

ROOT.	THIRD PERSON PRESENT.	PRETERITE.
bhrī	bharati	babhāra,
tri	tarati	tatāra.
tup	tupati	tutopa.

PARAGRAPH 3.

Of the preterperfect in Latin verbs.

Many Latin verbs form the preterperfect by reduplication, and there is reason to believe that the number was originally much more considerable. We may regard it as probable, that this was the oldest form of the preterperfect tense in the Latin language, as well as in the cognate idioms.

In some respects the Latin reduplicated preterite agrees with the Teutonic, in others with the Sanskrit, and with both more nearly than with the Greek.

1. Aspirate and double consonants are reduplicated in Latin as in Mœso-Gothic verbs; this is avoided in Greek and Sanskrit. In the Mœso-Gothic we have from the verb, *skaidan*, scheiden, to separate, the following :

Skáida ; skáiskáid, skáiskáidum ; skaidans.

In Latin we have in like manner :

sciscidi, from scindo.
spondeo   „   spospondi not sospondi.
fallo   „   fefelli   not πεfelli.

2. The vowel of the reduplicated syllable is in Greek always ε, in Mœso-Gothic ái. In Latin as well as in Sanskrit verbs the vowel of the verbal root is reduplicated; as in Sanskrit, the verbal root

mad,	makes	mamāda,
lish		lilesha,
tup		tutopa,

so in Latin,

pedo	pepedi,
mordeo	momordi,
tundo	tutudi,
curro	cucurri.[c]

In Latin, however, the reduplicated syllable follows the quantity of the verbal root; in Sanskrit it is always short, whatever may be the quantity of the root: [as it is also in Latin. ED.]

The following are some of the examples of reduplication yet remaining in Latin verbs.

memini, *i.e.* memeni.	spospondi.
momordi.	pepedi.
peperi.	poposci.
pupugi.	sciscidi.
tetigi.	pepigi, *i.e.* pepegi.[d]
totondi.	pepuli.
cucurri.	cecĭdi.
cecini, *i.e.* ceceni.	cecīdi.
didici.	tutudi.
fefelli.	

---

[c] The apparent exceptions from this rule seem to admit of explanation See Grimm, th. i., p. 1055.

[d] Pango and πήγνυμι being variations of πήγω.

Dr. Grimm has remarked that verbs which change a short vowel in the root or present tense into a long ē in the preterperfect had originally a reduplication. Pango, or rather pago, makes pepigi, but compingo makes compēgi. This proves the analogy of the two forms; and on the model of pago, pepigi, contracted to pēgi, we have

capio,	cēpi.
ago,	ēgi.
frango, *i.e.* frago	frēgi.
facio,	fēci.
jacio,	jēci
lego,	lēgi
emo,	ēmi.
venio,	vēni.
edo,	ēdi.
sedeo,	sēdi.
fugio,	fūgi.

It is observed in confirmation of this remark, that these verbs have in many instances a reduplication, or, what is allied to it, an internal inflection, in the cognate languages; as *cēpi* resembles *hôf* in Gothic; fugi, πέφυγα; lēgi, λέλογα; and venio, vēni, the Mœso-Gothic verb which is analogous to "come" and "came."

The custom of reduplication in forming the preterite fell into disuse; supplementary methods were found to answer the same purpose, the principal of which were the following:

1. The insertion of the letter s before the final i, as in

<div style="text-align:center">

repo,   repsi.
lego,   lexi.

</div>

2. The insertion of the syllable āv, īv, mutable into u, as

<div style="text-align:center">

am-av-i.
aud-iv-i.
doc-u-i.

</div>

The former of these methods is analogous to an inflection, of which we trace an extensive use, in the cognate languages; the latter is quite peculiar to the Latin. The av has been thought to be allied to the bo and bam of the future and imperfect preterite. [*Repsi*, etc., are really aorists. *Vid. not.* 16. Ed.]

<div style="text-align:center">

SECTION V.

</div>

Of the remaining forms of the Verb—Potential, Optative, and Conjunctive moods—Future tenses—Middle and Passive voices.

Most of the remaining forms of the verb appear to be simple inflections properly so termed, and not, as some have suspected, compound words. From this remark we must make an exception, as far as regards the pronominal suffixes, on which so much has already been said; for these are, as the reader is well aware, abbreviated words brought into composition with the verbs. With this exception, the moods and

tenses of verbs which are now to be considered may
be looked upon as formed in all probability by simple
inflection.   There are indeed some of these forms
which have been thought by late writers to have
derived their peculiar shades of meaning, in relation
to time and mode, from the insertion or addition of
significant particles, or other words of a similar use.[a]
But the instances in which this can be supposed
with any degree of probability are, in comparison
with others, very few, and the inference with respect
to them is but doubtful at best.   And in by far the
greater number of examples composition of words
seems to be out of the question ; and it is evident
that a mere inflexion has been employed, the ori-
ginal or simple verb having been by design some-
what modified in pronunciation, or by the addition
or insertion of a consonant or vowel, so as to impart
to it a sense in some mode or circumstance different
from the primitive one.

Thus it has often been remarked, that it is a cha-
racter common to the conjunctive, potential, and op-
tative forms of the verb to change proper vowels,
and especially short vowels, into diphthongs.   On

---

[a] I allude to Professor Bopp's opinion, and to some other similar conjec-
tures.   According to Bopp's, the future tenses are compounds of a verbal root,
or of an attributive vocable and certain forms of the verb substantive.
This conjecture has been supported with great ingenuity, and has even in its
favour a great number of coincidences.   But I think it is by no means esta-
blished.   Those, however, who are not acquainted with Professor Bopp's able
attempts to analyse the conjugations of verbs, will find their trouble amply
repaid in reading his " Conjugations-system der Sanskritsprache," and likewise
his observations subsequently published in the Annals of Oriental Lit. and
still more fully in his Grammatica Critica Linguæ Sanskritæ.

this fact a somewhat whimsical theory has been founded by the learned and fanciful Professor Murray. He says, "The subjunctive of all Greek, Latin, and Teutonic verbs arose from laying an emphasis expressive of the conditional state of the mind on the last syllable of the verb immediately before the personal pronoun. This emphasis not only drew the accent to the syllable, but also extended it by the insertion of *e* or *o* short, the consequence of protracted pronunciation." "The voice was kept up, and this inserted vowel gradually slid into union with that which supported the pronoun, and formed with it a long sound, expressive of suspense and incomplete indication." "The optative of all tenses had a similar origin. In wishing, we dwell on the word, and give it an unusual emphasis, the sign of strong, lingering, ardent desire." "In grief the emphasis is long, and uttered with a wailing, melancholy tone. The connection between *grief* and *desire* is close and obvious :

εἴθ᾽ ὡς ἡβώοιμι, βίη τέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη,
ὡς ὁπότε κρείοντ᾽ Ἀμαρύγκεα θάπτον Ἐπειοὶ—

The effects of this state of mind on the medium of thought, are, that the words are protracted, while the consonants rather sink and vanish."

Whatever may be thought of this explanation, the fact to which it relates is undoubtedly observed in the conjugations of Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Teutonic verbs. In all these, the substitution of diphthongs, and longer or more numerous

vowel sounds, is characteristic of the optative, poten-
tial, and conjunctive moods.

PARAGRAPH 2.

Of the future tenses.

The formation of future tenses deserves a parti-
cular notice.

Proper future tenses formed by inflection are en-
tirely wanting in the Teutonic languages.   In Latin,
Greek, and Sanskrit they are yet extant ; and in
all these, analogies are to be traced in their for-
mation.

The Sanskrit has two distinct future tenses,
which are formed as follows :

The first future, or perfect future, is formed by
adding *tā* to the verbal root, or rather by inserting
it between the root and the pronominal suffix.   This
syllable is often preceded by an additionally inserted
i, and in some of the persons it is *tas* rather than
tā.   Thus from the root याच् *yāch*, or rather the verb
yāchāmi, αἴτεω, we have yāchitāsmi, αἰτήσω, or, as
I here divide the words,

Present,   yāch-ā-mi
Future,   yāch-i-tās-mi.

The second future instead of the syllable tā or
tas, inserts syā, as yāchishyāmi, or

yāch-i-shyā-mi.

The स s is converted into ष ṣ[b] [and sometimes श sh] by the Sanskrit rules of euphony.

Future Tenses in Greek.

The first future in Greek is formed in a manner very similar to that of the second future in Sanskrit.

The termination of the first future seems originally, as it is observed by Matthiæ, to have been the same throughout, εσω from ω. Thus we find ὀλέσω from ὄλω, ἀρέσω from ἄρω. The middle voice ὄλεσομαι would indicate an active ὀλέσομι, which perhaps once existed, and which would be the regular form if the suffix μι had been preserved through the different tenses in Greek as it has been in Sanskrit.

The first future consists therefore in Greek in the insertion of ες before the pronominal suffixes, in analogy with the Sanscrit syā or ishyā.

It may be observed, that the terminations of this form of the verb, both in Greek and in Sanskrit, are identical with the future tense of the verb substantive, in Greek ἔσομαι and in Sanskrit syāmi. This is the principal foundation for the hypothesis of Professor Bopp, who considers many modifications of attributive verbs to be derived from a composition of a verbal root with the tenses of the verb substan-

---

[b] The Sanskrit sibilant ष is neither s nor sh. It is said to be pronounced by passing the voice, with the tip of the tongue applied to the fore part of the palate, and is represented in Wilkins's Grammar by ṣ. Sh is, perhaps, the mode of expressing it most nearly in our orthography.

tive. If other tenses corresponded with the termi-
nations of the verb substantive so closely as the
future, there would be sufficient evidence to support
this opinion. At present, we can only regard it as
an ingenious conjecture. The Celtic language, how-
ever, presents a feature which gives it a degree of
additional probability: to this we shall have occasion
hereafter to advert.

2. The second future in Greek is a slight inflec-
tion of the present, as λεγῶ, πιθῶ, from λέγω, πείθω.
The present tense is often used for the future by the
poets; and this form seems to have been originally
a mere change in the accent or emphasis of the
present, designed thus to mark a variety in the
sense. Some grammarians[o] have indeed maintained
that the supposed second future is merely a first
future in a different form, in which case there would
be no second future in Greek. This would be con-
trary to the analogy of the cognate languages.
However, it must be allowed that there is not in
Greek, as there is in Latin and in Sanskrit, a second
future distinguished from the first by a difference of
sense.

Latin Futures.

The future tenses in the Latin language are
formed in a great variety of ways.

1. The most simple form is a slight modification
of the present, regam, reges, reget being substituted

---

[o] See Dawes, Miscellanea Critica, p. 372.

for rego (which, according to the analogy already
pointed out, was perhaps originally regim), regis,
regit.   This recals those languages in which the
present tense is used for a future, and the British
future credav is nearly like it.   It is still more
closely allied to the conjunctive present regam,
regas, regat.   A slight difference in pronunciation
was adopted, to mark these varieties in the meaning
or in the relations of the verb to time and mode.
This is an instance of simple inflection.   Here is no
place for the hypothesis of compound verbs, or of
particles introduced and interpolated.

2. Another mode of giving to verbs a future
signification adopted by the Latin grammarians was
that of inserting a syllable, a method analogous to
that practised in Greek and in Sanskrit conjuga-
tions ; but instead of the εσ or σ of the Greek
futures, and the sya or ishya of the Sanskrit, the
Latins inserted er between the verb and the pro-
nominal suffix, the verb retaining the characteristic
of the preterperfect tense; as

<blockquote>
rex-er-o,   rex-er-imus.
audiv-er-o,   audiv-er-imus.
</blockquote>

The substitution of r instead of s appears in this
instance, as in a great many inflections in the Latin
language, to be an innovation, originating either
from some preference on account of euphony, or
from accidental variation of utterance.   The old
Latin form was in all probability similar to the
Greek, es being the syllable interpolated.   Rexeso

and rexesimus gáve a harsh and difficult sound, and were softened to rexero and rexerimus.[d]

3. A third species of future tense in Latin verbs arises from the insertion of b or rather of ab, eb, or ib. Even this has been referred to the composition of an attributive root with the verb substantive. Recourse has been had here to the verb fuo, analogous to bhū or be, as in the former instance to the verb अस् as, esse, or εῖναι. The terminations of the Latin future amabo, bis, bit, are supposed by Professor Bopp to have been derived from a Latin future of the verb substantive analogous to the Anglo-Saxon beo, bys, byth.

It is remarkable, with respect to both the Latin futures, that a slight change merely of the termination gives rise to a form of the verb, which has a preterite signification, as amavero (perhaps originally written amaverim, but subsequently distinguished from that conjunctive form) makes amaveram, and amabo (amabim?) makes amabam. This circumstance tends to render it most probable that there is nothing in the inserted *ba* or *bo*, which by itself gives either a past or future tense, and that it is merely through conventional use that any precise distinction of time is obtained from this modification of the verb. In Sanskrit and in Greek, as well as in Latin, the future tense is converted into a preterite by a change of the termination; this is connected

---

[d] On the substitution of r for s, I must refer the reader to sect. vi. of chapter ii., in which this subject is considered.

in the two last-mentioned languages with the addition of the augment.

The facility indeed with which these preterite forms of the verb, either with a slight modification, or without any change, are adopted with a future meaning, seems remarkable, when we first contemplate it; but the frequent occurrence of a parallel fact in different languages is calculated to lesson our surprise. What can be more strange and apparently anomalous than the changes connected in Hebrew with the use of the Vau Conversivum? In Hebrew the future imperative, optative, and potential forms are all identified, or nearly so, with each other, or one modification of the verb answers to all.

In like manner we find corresponding forms of the verb, which may be considered as the same identical inflections of the verbal root (if we make allowance for the varieties of orthography and termination proper to the cognate languages, or for the stated interchange of letters between them), denoting in one language a future, and in another a potential, or even a preterite tense, with something of the potential or conjunctive signification attached to it. Thus the Sanskrit future, the Greek aorist optative, and the Latin preterpluperfect have nearly the same endings. From the Sanskrit root yāch we have in the future,

<div align="center">yāch -ishyāmi.</div>

From αἰτέω, aor. 1. opt. αἰτ -ήσαιμι.

From quæro in Latin,   quæs-issem.

In the plural,   yách-ishyāmas.

αἰτ -ήσαιμεν, or μες.

quæs-issemus.

Here ishyāmi, ἔσαιμ, and issem, in which the e makes ēmus and ētis long, and was nearly equivalent to a diphthong, afford striking analogies, and are in fact the same form with slight varieties of orthography, but somewhat greater variety in signification.[18]

NOTE ON PARAGRAPH 2.

(18). *Future Tense.*—No question in comparative philology has received less attention than that concerning the origin and development of the future tense ; neither does the present note, by any means, profess to make good the deficiency. It merely refers the chief modes by which it is formed to three heads.

1. It is sometimes formed from the present by a mere change of accent. In English we say *I beát you if do not leave off*, etc. ; wherein *beát* means *will beat.* The so-called second future of the Greek language is, doubtless, a present thus modified in respect to its accent.

In the Anglo-Saxon, *beó, bist,* etc., are future rather than present. So are the Sarmatian (Slavono-Lithuanic) forms, *busu,* etc.

Now the root in question means not so much to *be* as to *become,* a fact which again shows how presents are also futures. Things which are *becoming* anything have a certain amount of action to go through before they have *become* it.

Again, things that have anything further to do may fail, as easily as they may succeed, in doing it. Hence, wherever there is futurity, there is contingency as well. This explains the subjunctive, conjunctive, or potential power of the English *be.* (See *English Language—on the Verb Substantive.*)

(2). The full explanation in detail of the undoubted affinities between the Latin words like *regam, regas,* etc., as *moods,* with

words like *regam, reges*, etc., as tenses, and the similar relations
in Greek between the non-augmented moods of the aorist and
the first future in general has yet to be given. It is clear, how-
ever, that the connection exists, and, also, that the difference
between mood and tense is less decided than the ordinary practice
of grammarians makes it.

3. The incorporation of a separate root has already been
indicated in the text as a mode of forming futures. Such roots
may be not only those suggested, but also the adverbs of future
time. There are many instances in the ruder languages of this
formation.

PARAGRAPH 3.

Middle and Passive Voices.

The Sanskrit has in its verbs three voices nearly
corresponding with the Greek.

The voices in Sanskrit corresponding with the
Greek middle and passive form themselves by a
similar change of termination with that of the verbs
in μι: as δίδωσι, or rather δίδωτι, is changed into
δίδοται, so bhavati is converted into bhavate. I
cannot but believe that the original form of the verb
in Sanskrit was

$$
\left.
\begin{array}{l}
\text{bhavāme,} \\
\text{bhavase,} \\
\text{bhavate,}
\end{array}
\right\}
\text{from}
\left\{
\begin{array}{l}
\text{bhavāmi.} \\
\text{bhavasi.} \\
\text{bhavati.}
\end{array}
\right.
$$

But the first person is, according to the established
inflections of the Sanskrit language, bhave, instead
of bhavāme.

I shall not pursue further at present the inflec-
tions of verbs in the different voices. The reader
will find enough to answer my chief design in a

succeeding chapter, in which examples of the regular verbs are inserted.

The termination most characteristic of passive tenses in Latin, viz. r, must here be mentioned, as it serves as a point of comparison between the Celtic and the Latin verbs.

Another point in which we shall find a relation between the Latin and the Celtic verbs, as likewise between the Greek and Celtic, is the defective state of the inflection of persons in the passive tenses. But we shall again take notice of this circumstance in its proper place.[19]

NOTE ON PARAGRAPH 3.

(19). *Middle and Passive voices.* — Many, perhaps most passives, are originally middle. Many, perhaps most middles, were originally the verb *plus*, the reflective pronoun. This is eminently the case in the Scandinavian languages.

In the particular case of the Latin language, excellent authorities have maintained that the r in *amor* (*I am loved*) is the s of *se ;* just as is the s in *jag kallas* = *I am called,* in Swedish.

CHAPTER VII.

Illustration of the principles developed in the preceding chapter. Conju-
gation of the verb substantive and of attributive verbs, both in the
other Indo-European languages and in the Celtic dialects.

SECTION I

General Remarks.   Analysis of the Verb Substantive in several languages.

THE preceding remarks will perhaps be deemed suf-
ficient to explain the general principles of verbal
inflection in the languages to which they refer; but
before I can proceed to my ultimate object, which is
to compare the Celtic verbs with those of the idioms
supposed to be cognate with the Celtic language, it
is requisite to illustrate the principles now developed
by some particular examples. I shall with this
view lay before my readers a brief analysis of the
verb substantive in Sanskrit, pointing out in the first
place the agreements of the Sanskrit with the other
languages generally allowed to be allied to it. I
shall afterwards endeavour to illustrate in a similar
manner the Celtic inflections, and to shew that they
manifestly partake in the same general analogies.

I have already observed, in the list of verbal
roots contained in a preceding section, that there are
in Sanskrit two verbs substantive, of which cognates
are found in various idioms. They are the verb
अस्मि asmi, from the root AS,[a] corresponding with esse

Rosen, Radices Sanskritæ, p. 52, 53.

or sum in Latin and εἰμὶ in Greek, and भवामि
bhavāmi from the root bhū, allied to the old Latin
verb fuo, and in the sense of *oriri*, *nasci*, which also
belongs to this Sanskrit root, to the verb φύω or
φῦναι in Greek. There is, I believe, no language in
which both of these verbs are extant in a complete
state, but they are least defective in Sanskrit, which
has lost many tenses of the verb asmi, though it has
preserved the whole of bhavāmi. The Persian has
two corresponding verbs, *būdan*, and *am* resembling
asmi: they are both defective, and each contributes
some tenses towards the conjugation of the verb sub-
stantive, which is thus made up of their fragments.
[Rather say that the Persian has the root *b-d*, and
certain personal forms which point to the root *-s*. See
p. 320. ED.] The Sclavonian verb substantive is
formed from similar elements; the present tense and
those dependent on it are nearly allied to asmi, and the
past tenses are derived from büt' or bud' the cognate
of būdan or bhū. The Teutonic languages display
the same formation: ist or is belongs to the former;
beon, be, been, to the latter element. In Latin fuo
and esse are combined in a similar manner. The
Celtic language, as I shall shew in the following
section, has one of these verbs in a more perfect
state than any other language except the Sanskrit.
The verb bu or bŷdh, corresponding with bhu or
buden, is nearly complete, if not entirely so; but
there are only fragments, as in other languages,
which resemble the cognates of asmi.

PARAGRAPH 1.

Verb asmi and its Cognates.

I shall now compare the principal parts of the verb asmi, and subjoin some corresponding forms in the cognate languages.

Present tense.

1. In Sanskrit.

	FIRST PERSON.	SECOND PERSON.	THIRD PERSON.
Sing.	asmi	asi	asti
Plur.	smah	stha	santi

N. These plural forms were originally (?)

	asmus	astha	asanti.

2. In Greek according to the old forms.

	FIRST PERSON	SECOND PERSON	THIRD PERSON
Sing.	ἐμμὶ	ἐσσὶ	ἐστὶ
Plur.	εἰμὲς	ἐστὲ	ἐντὶ.

3. In Latin.

Sing.	esum	es	est
Plur.	sumus	estis	sunt

4. In Persian.

Sing.	am	ī	ast
Plur.	īm	īd	and

5. Sclavonian.[b]

Sing.	yesm'	yesi	yest'
Plur.	yesmi	yeste	sut' for jesut'

6. In Lettish or Lithuanian.[c]

Sing.	esmi	essi	esti
Plur.	esme	este	esti

[b] Grimm, i, p. 1064. Vater, p. 98.   [c] Grimm, ibid.

7. In Mœso-Gothic.

Sing.	ïm	ïs	ist
Plur.	siyum	siyuth	sind

which according to Dr. Grimm was originally in the plural.

	ïsum	ïsuth	isind
or,	ïsam	isith	isand

It is at once evident, that all these are slight modifications of the same element conjugated by means of the same suffixes. The variation between the different languages is not exceeding such as exists between proximate dialects of the same speech.

The preterimperfect tense is not to be traced with so much regularity. It is in Sanskrit :

Sing.	āsam	āsīs	āsīt
Plur.	āsma	āsta	āsan.

In Latin, esam was probably the old form of eram, for s, as we have seen, was often changed into r, and esam would regularly form esem in the subjunctive, which is actually found:

Sing.	esam	esas	esat
Plur.	esamus	esatis	esant.

The second form of the verb in the arrangement adopted by Sanskrit grammarians is the potential. The potential form of the verb asmi bears a strong analogy to the old Latin potential siem, and, as M. Bopp has also shewn, to the Mœso-Gothic potential.

Singular.

Sanskrit,	syām	syās	syāt
Latin,	siem	sies	siet
Gothic,	siyau[d]	siyais	siyai

Plural.

Sanskrit,	syāma	syāta	syus
Latin,	siemus	sietis	sient
Gothic,	siyaima	siyaith	siyaina.

It may be observed that all these words have lost the initial vowel ă or ε, and that if it were restored the preceding forms would bear a near analogy to ἔσαιμι, which, though not extant, would be a regular derivative from the etymon of ἔσομαι.

The Sanskrit verb asmi has no future, but M. Bopp conjectures, with great probability, that syāmi, the adjunct by which a future tense is formed in attributive verbs, is in fact only the obsolete future of the verb asmi. A fact strongly favouring this hypothesis is, that a tense of this verb exists in Sanskrit, and is recognized as such, which is only used in forming the preterperfect tense of certain verbs. Āsa, āsitha, āsa, is termed the third preterite or aorist of asmi.[e] It is joined with kārayām from the verb karomi, facio, creo, and forms kārayāmāsa, fecit, creavit.

---

[d] This form is considered by Hickes (Thesaur. Ling. Sept., tom. i.) as a future tense, but Dr. Grimm has shewn that the Teutonic dialects have no simple future, properly so termed. The potential is, however, used for a future by Ulphilas. See Bopp, in Annals of Oriental Litt. p. 49.

[e] Wilkins's Sanskrit Grammar, p. 187.

There is only one other tense of the verb asmi, which is the imperative.

Sing.	asāni	edhi	astu
Plur.	asāma	sta	santu.

Compare astu, with ἔστω, esto; sta with ἐστὲ, este, and santu with sunto. The second person, edhi, bears, as we shall see, a strong analogy to some of the modifications of the verb substantive in the Celtic.

<h2 style="text-align:center">PARAGRAPH 2.</h2>

<p style="text-align:center">Verb bhavāmi and its cognates.</p>

I shall now give the principal parts of the Sanskrit verb bhavāmi, which is entire, though its cognates in most other idioms are only extant in fragments.

<h3 style="text-align:center">1. Present tense.</h3>

Sing.	bhavāmi	bhavasi	bhavati
Plur.	bhavāmas	bhavatha	bhavanti.

This tense exemplifies the personal endings in their complete state.

<h3 style="text-align:center">2. Potential.</h3>

Sing.	bhaveyam	bhaves	bhavet
Plur.	bhavema	bhaveta	bhaveyus.

This form corresponds with the Greek in αιμι, αις, αι, αιμεν, αιτε, αιεν.

<h3 style="text-align:center">3. Imperative.</h3>

Sing.	bhavāni	bhava	bhavatu
Plur.	bhavāma	bhavata	bhavantu.

<h3 style="text-align:center">4. First Preterite or Imperfect.</h3>

Sing.	abhavam	abhavas	abhavat
Plur.	abhavāma	abhavata	abhavan.

This tense has the abbreviated form of personal endings.

N. The preceding forms, considered as derived from the present tense, display that modification in the root (as bhava for bhu) which marks the different conjugations. The remainder, which may be compared with the tenses of the ἵστημι formed from στάω, have the root in its original state, and with respect to these tenses, there is only one conjugation in Sanskrit verbs.[f]

5. Second Preterite or Aorist.

Sing.   abhūvam   abhūs   abhūt.

Personal endings in the abbreviated form.
This corresponds with ἔφυν, ἔφυς, ἔφυ.

6. Reduplicate Preterite.

Sing.   babhūva   babhūvitha   babhūva
Plur.   babhūvima   babhūva   babhūvus.

This corresponds very closely with the Greek πέφυα, πέφυας, πέφυε, πεφύαμεν, πεφύατε, πεφύασι.

Babhūvima in its termination is allied to fuvimus from fuo.[g]

7. First Future.

Sing.   bhavitāsmi.

The personal endings nearly as in the present tense.

---

[f] The ten conjugations or forms of Sanskrit verbs differ from each other only in those tenses which are formed from the present. The first modifies the root and interposes *a* between it and the suffixes, as BHAV-Ā-MI from BHÚ. The second subjoins the suffixes immediately, as ASMI from AS. The third reduplicates in the present, as DADĀMI (δίδωμι) from DĀ. The fourth inserts yā between the root and suffixes, as DAMYĀMI (domo) from DAM (tame, domitus). The fifth inserts *nu* after the root, and corresponds exactly with the conjugation of ζεύγ-νυ-μι. The sixth modifies the termination of the root somewhat differently from the first, as MRIYATE (moritur) from the root MRI. The seventh inserts *n* in the root, as in Latin we find JUNGO from the root JUG-UM. The eighth resembles the fifth, but adds only *u* to roots ending in *n*. The ninth adds *na* to the root, and is analogous to the form of φθάνω, ἐλεείνω. The tenth inserts *i* in the root, and inflects like the first. These analogies have been pointed out fully by Dr. Murray (Hist. of European Languages).

[g] As by Ennius, "Nos sumu' Romani, qui fuvimus ante Rudini."

8. Precative.

Sing.   bhūyāsam.

The personal endings abbreviated.

9. Second Future.

Sing.   bhavishyāmi.

The personal endings in full. In Latin fuissem nearly approaches to the above form, or perhaps more closely to the following :

10. Conditional.

Sing.   Abhavishyam.

Personal endings abbreviated.

Infinitive Mood.

Bhavitum.

The infinitive mood in Sanskrit bears an analogy to the Latin supine.

Participles.

Adverbial Participle,	bhūtwā.
Passive,	bhūtah.
Pret. Reduplicate,	babhūvah.
Present,	bhavat.
Future,	bhavishyat.

The participles are given without their terminations, which are added in declining them, and resemble those of adjectives.

The preceding forms are given by grammarians as those of the active voice ; but this verb is inflected through two other voices, analogous to the middle and passive. Of these I shall only extract the present, the reduplicate preterite, and the participles.

Middle Voice or Átmanepadam.

Sing.	bhave	bhavase	bhavate
Dual.	bhavāvahe	bhavethe	bhavete
Plur.	bhavāmahe	bhavadhve	bhavante

In this we have only to supply the first personal ending मि, which the analogy of the other persons seems clearly to suggest, and the whole form will correspond nearly with the Greek.

Reduplicate Preterite.

Sing.	babhūve	babhūvishe	babhūve
Dual.	babhūvivahe	babhūvāthe	babhūvāte
Plur.	babhūvimahe	babhūvidve	babhūvire

Passive Present Tense.

Sing.	bhūye	bhūyase.

Personal endings as in the middle voice.

Reduplicate Preterite.

Same as in the Middle Voice.

Participles in the Middle Voice:

Present : Bhavamānah   bhavamānā   bhavamānam.

Reduplicate Preterite : Babhūvānah, ā, am.

Future : Bhavishyamānah.

Passive Present : bhūyamānah, ā, am.

The terminations would be represented correctly thus ; μάνος, μάνα, μάνον : and it is needless to remind the reader of the near correspondence of these forms with the Greek.

SECTION II.

Analysis of the Celtic Verb Substantive.

The verb substantive in Welsh grammars appears to a learner as if made up of the fragments of two

or three defective roots, like the verbs substantive of other European languages. But in reality there is in the Welsh a verbal root, which is cognate with the Sanskrit bhủ and the Persian būdan, and which is like the former, perfect, or very nearly so, having as many extant forms as the Welsh verbs generally possess. This verb is in the infinitive mood bôd, and bôd may perhaps be regarded as the root, although Dr. Davies gives that term to the third person singular of the preterite, which is bu, fuit. The third person of the future is, however, often the root of Welsh verbs, and this in the verb substantive is bydh, erit. Bydh, if not the root, is the basis on which most of the modifications of this verb are formed.

Regular verbs have in Welsh, besides the infinitive and imperative moods, five distinct tenses or forms: these are two futures, one of which is indicative and the other conditional or subjunctive, a preterimperfect, preterperfect, and preterpluperfect tense. All these forms are extant in the verb bôd. They are as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1.

1. Future Indicative.

Sing.	bydhav	bydhi	bŷdh.
Plur.	bydhwn	bydhwch	bydhant.

N. It must be observed that the Welsh *y* in the penultima is a short *ŭ*. The ending *av* in Welsh stands for *am* in Erse, and the *v* is equivalent to *mh*, or is a secondary form of *m*.

It may be worth while before we proceed further to compare with this the future tense of the verb substantive in the Russian, as a specimen of resemblance in one of the eastern branches of the European languages.

Sing. budu	budet'	budut'
Plur. budem'	budete	budut'.

Compare also the potential form of the verb būdan, to be, in Persian :

Sing. būdamī	būdī	būdī
Plur. būdīmī	būdīdī	būdandī.

2. Future Potential, Conditional or Subjunctive.

Sing. bydhwyv	bydhych	bydho
Plur. bydhom	bydhoch	bydhout.

This form is varied as follows :

Sing. bythwyv	bythych	bytho, etc.

and contractedly thus :

Sing. bwyv	bŷch	bô
Plur. bôm	bôch	bôut.

Compare with the preceding the indefinite or subjunctive form in the Persian, which is also termed a future.

Sing. būvam	būvī	būvad
Plur. būvīm	būvīd	būvand.

3. Preterimperfect.

Sing. bydhwn	bydhit	bydhai
Plur. bydhem	bydhech	bydheut.

This likewise is contracted by dropping the dh, as bawn for bydhwn.

N. This form is considered by Dr. Davies as appropriated to the subjunctive mood, oedhwn, which is derived from another root being used in the indicative. In regular verbs, in general, this tense belongs rather to the subjunctive than the indicative.

Compare with the preceding the preterite of the verb substantive in Persian.

| Sing. | būdam | būdī | būd |
| Plur. | būdīm | būdīd | būdand. |

4. Preterperfect Tense.

Sing.	1. bûm, poetice buum and buym. Lat. fui (olim fuim?)	
	2. buost	fuisti.
	3. bu	fuit.
Plur.	1. buom	fuimus.
	2. buoch	fuistis.
	3. buont and buant	fuerunt.

N. The relation of these inflections to the Latin is obvious.

In Greek and in Sanskrit the forms most allied to this preterite are the aorists, as,

Sing.	abhūvam	abhūs	abhūt,
	ἔφυν	ἔφυς	ἔφυ,
Plur.	abhūma	abhūta	abhūvan,
	ἐφύμεν	ἐφύτε	ἐφύσαν.

5. Preterpluperfect Tense.

The preterpluperfect tense bears also a near resemblance to the corresponding form in Latin, and this is still more striking if we restore the s in the place of r, where we have reason to believe that it originally stood.

LATIN.	WELSH.	LATIN.	WELSH.
fuesam	bhuaswn	fuesamus	bhuesym
fuesas	bhuasit	fuesatis	bhuesych
fuesat	bhuasai	fuesant	bhuesynt.

Imperative Mood.

Sing.   2. bydh, be thou.   3. bydhed, boed, bid.
Plur.   bydhwn.   bydhwch.   bydhant.

Infinitive Mood.
bôd.

Persian, būdan ; Russian, buit'.

The preceding are all the forms properly belonging to the verb bôd in the active voice, and, as before observed, they are as many as belong to any regular verb in Welsh.

Before we proceed further, it will be worth while to compare the present tense of the verb substantive in the Erse dialect of the Celtic, with a corresponding form in the Sclavonic language. The Erse has a present tense properly so called, although it is wanting in Welsh.

The infinitive mood and the root of this verb in Erse is beith, to be. The following is the negative form of the present tense:

1. In the Erse, properly so termed, or Irish Celtic.

Sing.	Plural.
1. ni fhuilhim	ni fhuilmid
2 ni fhuilhir	ni fhuilthidh
3. ni fhuilh	ni fhuilidh.[a]

---

[a] Gaëlic (*i.e.* Irish) Grammar, by E. O'C ——, printed by J. Barlow, Dublin, 1808.

2. In the Gaëlic of Scotland.

Sing.	Plural.
1. ni bheil mi	ni bheil sinn
2. ni bheil thu	ni bheil sibh
3. ni bheil e	ni bheil iad.[b]

Conditional form of the verb buit', to be, in Russian

Sing.	Plural.
1. ya bui buile	mü bui buili
2. tü bui buile	vü bui buili
3. one bui buile	oni bui buili.[c]

Passive Voice.

The Celtic grammarians, like the Sanskrit, distinguish passive forms of the verb substantive. The passive voice, however, in the Celtic, has only the third person singular throughout the moods and tenses.

1. Future Indicative.

bydhir.

2. Future Subjunctive.

bydher, byther, and contractedly, baer.

Note. With byther or bydhir the Latin futurus is evidently cognate.

3. Preterimperfect.

bydhid, contracted beid.

Note. Compare the Sanskrit, bhūyate.

4. Preterperfect.

buwyd.

Note. Compare the Sanskrit bhūtwā.

[b] Grammar prefixed to the Gaëlic Dictionary published by order of the Highland Society.

[c] Elémens de la Langue Russe, Petersbourg, 1768, p. 133. Praktische Grammatik der Russischen Sprache, von D. Johann Severin Vater : Leipzig, 1814, Tab. 7.

5. Preterperfect.

buasid and buesid.

Note. Compare in Latin fuisset or rather fuesit, the old form of fuerit.

PARAGRAPH 2.

Of defective verbs used as verbs substantive in the Celtic dialects.

Besides the verb bôd, which we have compared with its cognates, there are other defective verbs in the Celtic dialects used as parts of the verb substantive. In the Welsh it has been remarked that regular verbs want a present tense properly so termed. In fact, the Welsh grammarians give the denomination of a future to a particular form of the verb, which is used with both a future and present signification; and it is perhaps somewhat doubtful to which tense it properly belongs. That it is capable of expressing a present signification, without any metaphor or reference to the future, is fully evident from the instances adduced by the Welsh grammarian Dr. Davies, who observes that, in the Creed, the expression "Credo in Deum Patrem" is rendered by "Credav yn Nuw Dâd," and that in conversation " Mi a welav" means " I see," and " Beth medhi di," " what sayest thou?"

The following forms are considered as belonging to the present tense:

1. Sydh, and by apocope sy; est, is. This is used indefinitely in all numbers and persons.

2. Mae, est
   Maent, sunt, } only the third person extant.
3. Oes, est. This has no inflections, and is used
   only as a third person singular.
4. Yw, pronounced yū; est. This is also used in
   the same way as sydh, and it is likewise
   inflected, as follows:

Singular.

1. wyv, perhaps originally *ywyv*.
2. wyt or wyd.
3. yw.

Plural.

1. ym   2. ych   3. ynt.

There is another form of yw, with a sort of
reduplication, thus:

Sing. 1. ydwyv   2. ydwyt   3. ydyw.
Plur. 1. ydym   2. ydych   3. ydynt.

There is a poetical form yttwyv, yttwyt, etc.

Passive Form.

Welsh grammarians distinguish likewise a passive
form of this verb. It is as follows:

In the poets, and in the dialects of South Wales
and Powys, ys.

The poets have also ydis; it is commonly ydys.

Note. It must be observed that the Welsh *ys* is pronounced
like *us* in English, and exactly as the root अस् *as*, in Sanskrit.

The same root slightly modified, viz. is or isi, is

extant in the Erse and Scottish dialects of the Celtic;[d] as

Sing.   is mi, or is misi, I am.
           is tu,   thou art.
           is e,   he is.
Plur. 1. is sinn.   2. is sibh.   3. is iad.[e]

Preterimperfect tense, in Welsh.

1. Active or variable form.

Sing. 1. oedhwn.   2. oedhit or   3. oedh.
                         oedhyt.

Plur. 1. oedhym or   2. oedhych or   3. oedhynt or
         oedhem.   oedhech.   oedhent.

2. Passive or invariable form.
oedhid.

Cognates.

The form ys, which is perhaps the real etymon, is precisely the root in Sanskrit and in the European languages, which, adding the pronominal suffix always wanting in Welsh in the third person singular, as well as in the passive form, make of the same word, ἐστὶ, est, ist.[20]

Note. It is remarkable that the verb substantive has forms appropriated to the present tense, while all other Welsh verbs are destitute of them. This circumstance may be accounted for. There being two distinct verbs substantive, and each having that form which is used, as we have seen, in the generality of verbs, sometimes with a future and sometimes with a present signification, practice, founded on convenience, at length appropriated the use of one of them to the future, and the other to the present

---

[d] Lhuyd's English-Irish Dictionary.
[e] Shaw's Analysis of the Gaëlic Language.

tense. Hence bẏdh came to express "*it will be,*" and sydh, ys, and oes, "*it is,*" while, in respect to attributive verbs, which have a single form, the ambiguity still remains.

NOTE ON SECTIONS I. AND II.

(20). *The Verb Substantive.*—The author to whom we owe the important discovery that the pronoun of the personal endings of the verb was in the oblique rather than the nominative case, has also illustrated the nature of the verb substantive. In a series of papers in the third and fourth volumes of the Transactions of the Philological Society (to which the reader is referred), he has shown that, over a wide extent of language, the verb substantive is the adverb of time or place. Speaking roughly, *I call = calling my here.*

SECTION III.

Inflection of a regular verb in Welsh through its moods and tenses.

The root or origin of a verb in Welsh is, as the learned Dr. Davies remarked, for the most part a noun, as dysc, doctrina ; dyscais, docui ; câr, amicus ; carav, amo vel amabo. This substantive, adds the same writer, is generally identical with the third person singular of the future indicative (as in Hebrew the third of the preterite is the root), or with the second of the imperative, which forms are for the most part the same.

In some verbs, however, the third person of the preterite is the root, as aeth, daeth.

Indicative Mood, Present Tense.

There is, according to the Welsh grammarians,

no present tense in attributive verbs, and this tense is supplied by a circumlocution, as

wyv yn caru, literally, εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν, I am loving.

Note. All the other tenses may be formed by a similar circumlocution.

Preterimperfect Tense.

Sing.	1. carwn	2. carit	3. carai
Plur.	1. carem	2. carech	3. carent.

A tense seldom used in the indicative.

Preterperfect Tense.

Sing.	1. cerais, *i.e.* kerais	2. ceraist	3. carodh
Plur.	1. carasom	2. carasoch	3. carasant.[a]

The principle on which this and the following tense are formed seems to be the insertion of the syllable *as* or *ais* between the root and the personal endings, and a change of the radical vowel in a mode analogous to the Sanskrit form guna. Both these changes have been traced in the inflection of verbs in the Sanskrit and European languages. And the modification of the vowel by guna is, in Sanskrit, as in Welsh, confined to particular persons in the tense.

Preterpluperfect Tense.

Sing.	1. caraswn	2. carasit	3. carasai
Plur.	1. carasem	2. carasech	3. carasent.

---

[a] See Dr. Davies's Grammar, entitled, Antiquæ Linguæ Britannicæ Rudimenta, from which, and from the grammar prefixed to Richards's Dictionary, the following as well as the preceding conjugations of Welsh verbs are extracted.

Future Tense.

Sing.	1. carav	2. ceri	3. câr
Plur.	1. carwn	2. cerwch	3. carant.

Imperative Mood.

Sing.	1. ——	2. car	3. cared
Plur.	1. carwn	2. cerwch	3. carant.

Potential, Optative, and Subjunctive Mood.
Present Tense wanting.
Preterimperfect Tense.

Sing.	1. carwn	2. cerit	3. carai
Plur.	1. carem	2. carech	3. carent.

Poetic Form.

Plur.	1. cerym	2. cerych	3. cerynt.

Preterperfect and Preterpluperfect.

Sing.	1. caraswn	2. carasit	3. carasai
Plur.	1. carasem	2. carasech	3. carasent.

Or, Poetic Form.

Plur.	1. caresym	2. caresych	3. caresynt.

Future Tense.

Sing.	1. carwyv	2. cerych	3. caro.
Plur.	1. carom	2. carech	3. caront.

Infinitive Mood.

caru, amare.

This one form, taking various prefixes, as yn caru, in amando, serves the purpose of Infinitive, Gerunds, and Supines.

Passive Voice.

The Welsh language has a proper passive voice;[b] but the tenses have no variety of endings to distinguish the persons.

Indicative Mood, Present Tense.

Formed by a circumlocution, the infinitive used as a gerund, being constructed with the passive form of the verb substantive; as

$$\text{yr ydys yn} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{vy ngharu,} & \text{amor.} \\ \text{dy garu,} & \text{amaris.} \\ \text{ei garu,} & \text{amatur.} \end{array} \right.$$

Note. Literally εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ μοῦ φιλεῖν, etc.

The plural is similarly formed; but the future is likewise used as a present tense.

Preterimperfect Tense.

Cerid vi, ti, ev, ni, chwi, hwynt.

Preterperfect Tense.

Carwyd vi, ti, etc.   Amātus, sum, es, est, etc.

Preterpluperfect Tense.

Carasid, or caresid, vi, ti, etc.

Future Tense.

Sing.   Cerer vi, ti, ev.

Plur.   Cerir ni, chwi, hwynt.

[b] In this as well as in the number of tenses in the active voice, the Celtic language is richer than the Teutonic. In the latter, according to Dr. Grimm, the Mœso-Gothic is the only dialect that preserves any remains of a passive voice; and in that only the present tense indicative and subjunctive is extant. The following words are examples: galeikôda, it is likened; galeikozâu, thou mayest be compared; haitanda, we are called; halyáindau, they may be hidden. Grimm's D. Gram. p. 855. There are likewise some indications of a middle voice in the Gothic version.

Imperative Mood.

Sing. and Plur. Carer vi, di, ev, ni, chwi, hwynt.

Potential Mood, Present Tense.

Sing. and Plur. Cerir vi, di, etc.

Preterimperfect Tense.

Sing. and Plur. Cerid vi, di, etc.

Preterpluperfect Tense.

Sing. and Plur. Caresid vi, di, etc.

Future Tense.

Sing. and Plur. Carer vi, di, etc.

Participles.

Caredig { i dhyn,   amans homini.
         { gan dhyn, amatus ab homine.
         { dyn,   amatus vel dilectus hominis.

Caradwy, amandus.

Note. This form is nearly analogous to the Sanskrit adverbial participle bhū-twā.

Such are the inflections of passive verbs in the Welsh language. They contain but a few instances of interpolated syllables, and those have been already remarked. The greater part of these inflections consists, excluding the personal endings or affixes, of slight variations in the final syllables, and chiefly in the vowels, very analogous to the changes which distinguish the moods and tenses of the passive voice of Latin verbs, particularly in the third conjugation.

SECTION IV.

Conjugation of a regular Verb in Erse.

Present Tense, Indicative Mood.

Verb, Cesaim or kesaim, I torment.

Note. The root of the verb is said to be the first person of the present tense, the last syllable being cut off.

Sing. 1. Cesaim.   2. cesair.   3. cesaidh.

Plur. 1. Cesamaid or } 2. Cesthaí.   3. cesaid.
         cesam   }

Preterite.

Sing. 1. Do chésas.   2. chésas.   3. chés.

Plur. 1. Do chesamar }   (chesadar
              or   } 2. chesabhar.   3. {   or
       do chessam   }   (chessad.

Note. It may be perceived that the form of the present cesaim nearly corresponds with that which the Welsh grammarians term a future tense terminating in *av*, and that the preterite in *as* agrees with the Welsh preterite in *ais*. The Erse language has adopted a peculiar form for a future tense, made by inserting a syllable *fa* between the root and the personal endings. This insertion, however, is not used in all verbs.

Future Tense.

Sing. 1. Cesfad.   2. cesfair.   3. cesfaidh.

Plur. 1. Cesfamaid or } 2. cesfaidhe.   3. cesfaid.
         cesfam.   }

Imperative.

Sing. 1. ——————   2. ces.   3. cesadh.

Plur. 1. Cesam.   2. cesaidhe   3. cesaid or
                                                  cesadis.

Potential Mood.

Preterimperfect Tense.

Sing. 1. Do chesfainn.   2. chesfa.   3. chesfadn.
Plur. 1. Do chesfamair.   2. chesfaidhe.   3. chesfaidis.

Infinitive Mood.

Cesadh or do chesadh, to torment.

Note. The different tenses have another form without the personal endings, in which case the personal pronouns are immediately subjoined.

Passive Voice.

Indicative Mood, Present Tense.

Cestar me, thu, é, inn, ibh, iad.

Note. As in Welsh, only one form in the passive for all the pronouns.

Preterite.

Do chesadh me, thu, etc.

Future.

Cesfaidher me, thu, etc., or cesfar me.

Imperative.

Cestar me, thu, etc.

Potential, Preterimperfect.

Do chesfaidhe me, thu, etc.

Infinitive.

Do bheit cesta, to be tormented.

Participle.

Cesta, tormented.

For the varieties and irregularities of verbs in the Erse, as well as of the Welsh, I must refer to the grammars of those languages.

SECTION V.

Concluding observations on the Celtic Verbs, with general remarks on the grammatical peculiarities of the Celtic languages.

The observations made in the two last chapters allow us to conclude that the inflection of verbs in the Celtic dialects, excluding for the present the consideration of suffixes, or the systems of personal endings, which were previously compared, is founded on principles similar to those which prevail in the Sanskrit and in several European languages. The Celtic verbs do not display any traces of the preterite by reduplication, which is so remarkable a feature in the eastern branches of the Indo-European stock of languages, and which is also found in the Latin and Teutonic; but they change the middle vowels in a mode analogous to that which these four languages possess, under the form termed guna by Sanskrit grammarians, and they interpolate similar consonants or syllables for the purpose of distinguishing moods and tenses, the varying terminations, particularly in the passive voice, being closely analogous to those of the other old European idioms, and especially to the Latin.

When we connect the consideration of these analogies with the results formerly obtained on comparing the systems of personal endings or suffixes, it will perhaps not be going too far to say, that the

whole structure of inflections in the Celtic dialects is founded on principles similar to those which are the groundwork of verbal conjugations in the other languages compared with them.

The principal affections which words undergo in the construction of sentences in the Celtic languages, may be referred to two heads; first, interchanges between cognate letters on a principle which we have compared with that of sandhi; and, secondly, the inflections of verbs. In these consists a great part likewise of the peculiarity of the Sanskrit language.[a] In both respects there is a remarkable congruity between the Celtic and the Sanskrit. There is a third series of variations in words common to the Sanskrit and several European idioms, in which the Celtic dialects are more defective than some other ancient languages of Europe and of the East, I mean the declensions of nouns.

Welsh nouns make their plural number nearly on the same principle as several of the European languages. They add terminations in i, au, ion, etc. and they vary the interior vowels of words.

Welsh nouns have no cases properly so called, but the want of them is supplied by prepositions which have not coalesced with the words governed by them, as they appear in other languages to have done in such a manner as to give origin to cases.[b]

[a] The different forms of samāsa and sandhi occupy a considerable space in the Sanskrit grammars of Vadarāja and Vopadeva.

[b] Such at least, according to the opinion defended by Bopp, is the origin of Sanskrit cases, and therefore also of Greek and Latin, which so nearly resemble

In the Erse dialect nouns have a very peculiar mode of declension. The following may serve as an example:

An bard, a poet.

Sing.	Nom.	an bard,	Plur.	Nom.	na baird,
	Gen.	an bhaird,		Gen.	na mbhard,
	Dat.	o'n mbard,		Dat.	o na bardaibh,
	Acc.	an bard,		Acc.	na barda,
	Voc.	a bhaird.		Voc.	a bharda.

It is worth while to notice particularly the dative plural, which generally terminates in *aibh*, though this perhaps admits of a variety, for it is given by Lhuyd in *uibh*. The terminations in *uibh* or *aibh* are plainly related to the old Latin dative, in *obus* and *abus*, which was probably the genuine and original form of this case in Latin. The Sanskrit datives plural end in ābhyas or ābhyah, or at least in bhyas after a vowel, as राजभ्यस् rājabhyas ; Latin, regibus ; Erse, righaibh or rioghaibh.

SECTION VI.

General Inference.

I have thus laid before my readers the most obvious and striking analogies between the Celtic

them. Professor J. Grimm, however, who has examined, with a view to this question, the cases of the Mœso-Gothic and other Teutonic dialects, seems inclined to a different opinion, as far as those languages are concerned. He concludes his inquiry into this subject (Bedeutung der Casusflexion) with the remark—" Die Casuszeichen bleiben mir ein geheimnisvolles Element das ich lieber jedem Worte zuerkennen will, als es von einem auf alle übrigen leiten." Th. i. p. 835.

dialects, and the languages which are more gene-
rally allowed to be of cognate origin with the San-
skrit, Greek, and Latin.   On the facts submitted to
them, they will form their own conclusion. Probably
few persons will hesitate in adopting the opinion,
that the marks of connexion are too decided and
extensive to be referred to accident or casual inter-
course, that they are too deeply interwoven with the
intimate structure of the languages compared, to be
explained on any other principle than that which
has been admitted by so many writers in respect to
the other great families of languages belonging to
the ancient population of Europe, and that the Celtic
people themselves are therefore of eastern origin, a
kindred tribe with the nations who settled on the
banks of the Indus, and on the shores of the Medi-
terranean and of the Baltic.   It is probable that
several tribes emigrated from their original seat in
different stages of advancement in respect to civili-
zation and language, and we accordingly find their
idioms in very different degrees of refinement; but
an accurate examination and analysis of the inti-
mate structure and component materials of these
languages, is still capable of affording ample proofs
of a common origin.

My present inquiry has been professedly con-
fined to language; and I must refer to my former
work for the confirmations which the inferences
now deduced may obtain from other sources.

NOTE ON THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

AT the conclusion of a work designed to illustrate the mutual affinity of those idioms which are termed collectively Indo-European, it will not be improper to add a few remarks on the relation between the latter and two other families of languages, which have co-existed with them from the earliest periods of history.

One of these is the class of idioms termed by German philological writers, *Semitic* languages. This designation was, I believe, first suggested by Eichhorn, who has remarked that the three principal branches into which the idioms belonging to this class divide themselves—viz. the Hebrew or the dialect of Palestine and Phœnice, the Arabic, and the Aramæan or northern Semitic spread over Syria and Mesopotamia—are as nearly related to each other as the Ionic, Æolic, and Doric dialects of Greek.[a] The term *Semitic* has been thought by some to be objectionable, on the ground that several of the nations who spoke the languages so denominated, in common with the descendants of Shem, were of Hamite origin, as the Phœnicians or Canaanites. It has, however, got into general use, and must therefore be retained. Schlözer,[b] the learned editor of Nestor's annals, has proposed on similar grounds to name the Indo-European dialects *Japetic* languages, most of the nations by whom they are spoken having descended, as it is generally believed, from Japhet. We might perhaps,

[a] Einleitung in das Alte Testament, von Joh. G. Eichhorn, B. i., p. 49. Dritt. Ausg.

[b] A. L. Schlözer, von den Chaldæern, Repertorium für biblische und morgenlændische Literatur. th. 8.

with less hesitation, apply the term *Hamite* to the third family of languages, to which I have alluded. I refer principally to the dialects of the old Egyptian speech, the Coptic, Sahidic, and Bashmuric, including *conjecturally*, until the mutual relations of these languages shall have been more fully investigated, several idioms spoken by races of Africa, in whose history marks are to be found of connection with the ancient subjects of the Pharaohs. One of these is the dialect of the Nouba, Barábra or Berberins of the Upper Nile, a race who strikingly resemble the ancient Egyptians in their physical characters, as we know by comparing the present Berberins with the paintings and mummies preserved in the Egyptian catacombs.[c] They are probably the offspring of the ancient Ethiopians of Meroë, who in a later age were the subjects of queen Candace. Another race, much more extensively spread in Africa, are the descendants of the Libyans. The Showiah, spoken by the Kabyles among the Tunisian mountains, and the Amazigh of the Berbers and the Shilha of mount Atlas, are dialects of their language, which has been traced from the oasis of Siwah to the Atlantic ocean, and which seems also to have been the idiom of the Guanches in the Canary islands, whose curiously desiccated mummies bear, as Blumenbach has shewn, much resemblance to those of the Egyptians, and indicate a very ancient connection among the tribes of northern Africa in arts and customs.[d]

It seems to be the prevalent opinion among philological writers of the present time, that the three classes of languages above referred to, namely, the Indo-European, the Semitic, and the Egyptian dialects, are entirely unconnected with each other, and betray no traces even of the most remote affinity. A late writer, whom I have before

[c] Researches into the Physical History of Mankind, vol. i.
[d] Blumenbach's Decades Craniorum.

cited, seems to hold this opinion in a very decided manner in reference to the Semitic and Indo-European idioms.

" It has been asserted," says Col. Vans Kennedy, " that the Greek contains more Arabic words than is generally supposed ; but until these words are produced, and their identity established, I must doubt the correctness of this assertion ; for I have never been able to discover any such identical terms."   He concludes, that " the portions of Asia which comprises Arabia and Syria was peopled, or at least inhabited from time immemorial, by a distinct race of men, who spoke a language peculiar to themselves; and that this language, with its cognate dialects, has been at all times confined to these countries, and that it never has extended its influence beyond their limits, except to a small part of Africa."

It must be allowed, that the Semitic dialects constitute a very distinct department of languages, which can by no means be associated or brought into the same class with the Indo-European idioms; yet it is by far too much to affirm that there are no traces of connection between the two classes.   In the preceding remarks upon the Indo-European languages, some futures have been pointed out which display a remarkable analogy to the well-known characters of the Hebrew and its cognate dialects; I shall only instance the system of pronominal suffixes.   This is one point in which the Celtic, at the same time that it appears to be the least artificial and grammatically culti-vated of the Indo-European languages, forms an interme-diate link between them and the Semitic, or perhaps indicates a state of transition from the characters of one of these classes of languages to those of the other.

In my work on the Physical History of Mankind, I ventured to remark, that a very considerable number of the vocables belonging to the Semitic dialects, may be

recognized in some of the Indo-European languages. It would be foreign to the object of the present work to enter at large into a proof of this opinion ; but I shall here adduce a few instances of undoubtedly cognate words, which will be sufficient to render it probable that a much larger number may be discovered by an extensive and accurate research.

Among the first ten numerals there are a few terms which appear to be cognate :

SEMITIC DIALECTS.	INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.
1. echad (Heb.)	eka (Sanskrit)
	yak or ek (Pers.)
3. Ordinal in Chald.	Ordinal in Sanskrit.
תְּלִיתַי tlithay (Dan. ii. 39).	tritiya.
6. shesh (Heb.)	shash (Sansk.)
7. shevang (Chald.)	seven, sibun, etc. (Germ.)

The following are some verbal roots and nouns which are evidently of the same origin. Among them are verbs which nearly resemble the two verbs substantive already traced in the Indo-European language :

בַּיִת bith from בּוּת buth (Chald.) to tarry, dwell, (Dan. vi 18.) often used in the Targum for לוּן. In Arabic this word is بَات bāt, or بَيْت bait, to tarry, be situated.[e]

beith (Erse.)
bŷdh, bôd (W.)
būdan (Pers.)
bhū (Sansk.)
be, beon (Teut.)

But the verb in Hebrew which closely corresponds with the Indo-European verb substantive, and is in fact identical with it, is יֵשׁ yesh, he is ; in Arab. أيس īs.[f]

It can hardly be doubted that יֵשׁ is a real cognate of the Indo-European verb. See page 221, above.

is (Erse.)
ys (Welsh)
as (Sanskrit)
etc., etc.

---

[e] Buxtorf. Lex. Heb. p. 69. Michaëlis, Supplem. in Lex. Heb. voce בּוּת
[f] Gesenius's Lexicon, Cambridge edition. See Genes. xxviii. 16. Deuteron. xxix. 17, etc. p. 316.

SEMITIC DIALECTS.	INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.
khól (whole, all)	ὅλος.
	hôlh (Welsh.)
hôr, horim, hori (mountain)	ὄρος, ὄροι.
láish (lion)	λέων.
leōm (people)	λεώς.
luach (a stone table)	lhêch (a flat stone.)
	λίθος
loang (throat, swallow)	lung, lingua.
tor, tori (Chald.)	ταῦρος, ταῦροι
keran (Chald.)	cornu, κέρας·
gúvra (Chald.)	gwr, vir.
ærez, in Chald. ארעא—argha⎫	erda.
(ע being, however, often mu-⎪	erth.
table into d, which would⎬	dhara, daiar.
make ærda.⎭	terra.
עבי gnabi, (clouds)	nabhah (Sansk.)
	nubes.
נער, pronounced Νερ in Ori-⎫	narah (Sansk.)
gen's Hexapla Hos. ii. i. (a⎬	ἀνήρ.
youth.)⎭	
נערה—naærah, puella.	narī (Sansk.)
ganaz	γάνος
chetoneth	χιτών
sepel (Jud. v. 25), (a cup)	simpulum.
yayin	vinum.

Here we find ' standing for the digamma or vau. An insertion of the vau will convert many Hebrew into Indo-European words, as

2. yadang (know), in Pih. yid-dang.　vidan, εἰδεῖν.
οἶδα, veda.

3. halak　walk.

4. rong (evil)　wrong.

5. chiva (an animal), chavah (life).　vivo, viva, jīva (Sanskrit.)

6. ragang　ῥήγνυμι, frango, i.e. frago.

kúm (arise, come)　komm, come.

laat (to hide, secret)　lateo, λήθε.

SEMITIC DIALECTS.	INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.
arar, aru, ar (curse)	ἄρα, ἀράομαι.
ād	ad, at.
lakak, also lakhak and likhak	lih (Sansk.) λείχω, lick.
אוּד ud	udas, ud (Sansk.) ὕδωρ, etc.
thiggenu (Gen. iii. 5.)	θιγγάνετε (Gen. iii. 5.)
tardemah ex radam	traum, dream.
mōth	motus.

moth and }	meath }
mēth }	meatham } Erse, to die.

| olem (age) | olim (Lat.) |
| charats (cleave, wound slightly, Gesenius) } | χαράσσω } scratch. |

לָעָה laghah (to babble)	
לָעֵז laghaz (speak barbarously)	The same element in λακέω, laugh, lächeln, loquor?
לָעַג laghag (laugh and speak unintelligibly)	
In all these we recognise one element.	

PRONOUNS.

atta, pron. (thou)	tu.
ta, suffix.	ta, tha, suffix in Sanskrit.
hi (she)	hi, si.
hu (he)	evo.
anu, suffix nu.	ni, nos, nau.

No sufficient comparison of the Egyptian and other Northern African dialects with each other and with the Semitic languages has been made to allow of any general statement as to their relations. I may however observe, that those who have denied that any affinity can here be traced appear rather to have presumed the fact than to have proved it. The affinity of some striking words among the personal pronouns in the Egyptian and Hebrew languages is such as to excite a strong suspicion that more extensive resemblances exist, though it does not appear

probable that the idioms of Northern Africa are even so nearly related to the Semitic, as the latter are to the Indo-European languages.[21]

NOTE.

(21). *The Semitic Languages.*—The remarks upon the African Languages under section i., Introduction, apply to the statements of this note.   Whatever else they may be, the Semitic languages are, in the first instance, African.

SUPPLEMENTARY   CHAPTER.

SECTION I.

SKETCH OF THE CHIEF WORKS ON KELTIC ETHNOLOGY, PUBLISHED
SINCE A.D. 1831.—BOPP AND PICTET.

Having now given the text of Dr. Prichard, along with
such observations as his statements more especially demanded, I
remind the reader that no less than twenty-five years have elapsed
since the researches under notice first saw the light.   This is a
period sufficiently long to allow of considerable changes in any,
more especially a philological, doctrine ; inasmuch as philology
and ethnology, between them, have, within the last quarter of a
century, engrossed a considerable amount of attention.

Most of the divisions of philological and ethnological study
have done this, the Keltic as much as the others—as much, and,
perhaps, more.   With the Keltic languages, however, as with
many more, the fruits have, by no means, been proportionate to
the labour bestowed on their cultivation.   To a certain extent
the work before us was the commencement of a better era.   To
a certain extent it displaced a great amount of loose and unsatis-
factory speculation.   To a certain extent it prevented the eccen-
tric comparisons and far-fetched etymologies which have enabled
men, with more learning than criticism, to find Kelts everywhere.

Without pretending to exhaust the subject, I shall, in the pre-
sent addendum, give a brief notice of the chief works which
illustrate the history of opinion in Keltic ethnology since 1831.
These are neither few nor far between ; indeed, they constitute
a little literature.   Several are English, some French, the ma-
jority German.   In order to find a place in the present notice
they must be, like the work which gives occasion to bring them
forward, ethnological as well as philological—I might say ethno-

logical *rather* than philological. If not, works of pure scholarship —works with which I feel myself wholly unfit to deal—would command attention.

Omitting these, and limiting ourselves to the treatises which have a decided and manifest ethnological aspect, we first come to those that either confirm, or contradict, the doctrine of the present volume.

The writers who most especially confirmed and developed the doctrine in support of which the work of Dr. Prichard was written, were Bopp[1] of Berlin, and Pictet[2] of Geneva. To the former of these investigators the subject had a special interest; inasmuch as his great work, the Comparative Grammar (*Vergleichende Grammatik*) of the so-called Indo-European languages, was, in a certain sense, incomplete so long as the fact of the Keltic being in the same class with the Latin, Greek, German, Norse, Slavonic, Lithuanic, and Sanskrit was pretermitted. At the same time, the Eastern Origin of the Keltic Nations was published before the Vergleichende Grammatik was completed. It could scarcely, however, have found its way into Germany before it was begun. Not appearing in the greater work of the author's, the Keltic languages formed the subject of a new series of papers.

As far as knowledge of the languages with which he dealt, and skill in the manipulation of letter-changes make a philologue, the author of the Vergleichende Grammatik had (and has) few rivals. On the other hand, few scholars have looked less carefully at the principles of philological classification. The question as to the extent to which the admission of the Keltic into the (so-called) Indo-European class raised the value of the class seems never to have been asked. And, as the same point was ignored in other investigations, the charge of having widened the Indo-European group to such a degree as to make it no class at all, lies, very decidedly, against the Prussian Professor. Besides endorsing and expanding the views of Prichard, he has, elsewhere, connected the Malay and the Georgian with the Indo-European tongues, as, indeed, they are in one sense; but not in the sense either originally given to the term, or the sense in which it can conveniently be retained.

Pictet, like Bopp, worked sedulously and skilfully at the

---

[1] Die Celtische Sprachen, etc. *Berlin*, 1839.
[2] De l' affinité des Langues Celtiques avec le Sanskrit. *Paris*, 1837.

letter-changes, and added a great number of details. The main fact of the Keltic being Indo-European was sufficiently made out by Prichard. The works, however, of both Pictet and Bopp were anything but superfluous. On the contrary, they were of great service to philology. In the first place they satisfied those who delighted in the kind of evidence (the letter-change testimony) they supplied. In the next, they stamped the doctrine with a considerable amount of authority. It may also be added that, whereas Prichard had looked to the Welsh rather than the Irish, Bopp and Pictet looked to the Irish rather than the Welsh.

The real condition, however, in which Prichard left the question was this; viz. that if the value of the class called Indo-European was to be raised by any fresh additions, the Keltic group of languages should form either the part or the whole of such additions. More than this I cannot find in his paper. More than this I cannot find in either Bopp's or Pictet's. More than this I cannot find anywhere. By which I mean that I nowhere find evidence upon either of the two following questions :—

1st. That the Kelt (or, indeed, any other language) can be made Indo-European without raising the value of the term.

2nd. That any good is effected by so raising it.

If the writers in question expressed themselves to the fact that the tongues in question were absolutely Indo-European, or (still more), if they derived them from the East, they left omissions in their argument which, to say the least, were illegitimate.

And here I may remark that the question as to how far additions may be made to certain classes, is by no means confined to European and Asiatic philology. In Africa the same question arises as to the value of Kaffre, or (as writers began to call it) the South African class. It has one (or more) very remarkable grammatical peculiarity. The same appears in the Timmani, a language near Sierra Leone, far away from the Cape, or even the northern frontier of the languages allied to the Kaffre.

How are we to value this? It is one thing to connect a given language with a certain fresh alliance, but it is another thing to separate it from an old one. What, for instance, if we make the Timmani Kaffre, is to be done with the languages of the group to which the Timmani previously belonged? Are *they* all to become Kaffre also? Why not? All that can be said,

even if they are removed and re-associated, is that a class pre-
viously large has taken a further extension. There is no objec-
tion to this, provided the fact be distinctly announced, and the
magnitude, value, or compass of the class thus created be of
moderate dimensions.

The fact that the value of a class has been raised should not
only be distinctly announced, but some rough measure of its
value should be given.

But where should we end if we extended the import of the
term Indo-European as many writers would extend it? Not till
we reached the Pacific. Supposing, however, that we stopped
then, what would follow? Even this; that, having got one
large class, we should have to break it up into its minor divisions,
and so have to end where we began.

SECTION II.

SKETCH OF THE CHIEF WORKS, ETC. — EXPANSION OF PRICHARD'S DOCTRINE—PRELIMINARY REMARK—NEWMAN.

Were the Keltic tongues more especially like any one of the
previously recognised Indo-European tongues than the rest?
Before we answer this question it is well to consider a prelimi-
nary point. A language, in the eyes of the investigator, is always
likest the one with which he most particularly compares it.
Hence the apparent affinities of a given tongue depend, in a
great measure, upon the previous knowledge of the men who
cultivate it. When the Sanskrit was taken as the representative
of the Indo-European class, and the Welsh and Irish were com-
pared with the Indo-European languages in general, but with the
Sanskrit (as their representative) in particular, the very force of
circumstances would exaggerate the Sanskrit affinities; and there
are not wanting casual observations, if not absolute statements,
to the effect that the Keltic is pre-eminently Indian.

Again, the relations of the British language to the English have
determined a considerable amount of comparisons between the
Keltic and German; Anglo-Saxon and English more particularly.
If these make the Anglo-Saxon Keltic, they also make the Keltic
Anglo-Saxon.

There is, then, a certain amount of similarity which is more apparent than real ; or (rather) the preponderance of similarity is often determined by accidental circumstances which give us only one-sided views.

Let us lay these out of the question ; and ask whether any *real* affinities of a special kind have been found between the Keltic and its congeners.

Of course, if the Keltic tongues were Indo-European they would have certain affinities with the Latin. How far they were special or not was another question. The writer who has done most in investigating this is Professor Newman, whose writings have been already referred to.

They showed, beyond doubt, that a great number of words which were common to the Latin and Keltic, were original to the latter rather than the former language ; so that the doctrine that either the Gallic of Gaul, or the Welsh of Britain, had taken up a certain amount of Latin elements became untenable.

But was there any taking up or borrowing at all ? Might not both have belonged to some common mother tongue, and (as such) have been Indo-European in general rather than either Latin or Keltic ? That this was the case, provided the Keltic had not borrowed from the Latin, was, I imagine, the common opinion. That the Latin had borrowed from the Keltic few maintained.

But that the Latin *has* so done, is the palmary doctrine of F. Newman ; who holds (and on sound ground) that some Keltic tongue stood in the same relation to the Latin as the Anglo-Norman did to the English ; *i.e.* that there was an intrusive element in the Latin tongue, and that that tongue was Kelt. There are several details besides this in his papers, but the chief fact is the one just given, and the notification of it gave a definite impulse to Keltic philology, and that in a right direction.

The other main doctrine of the same investigator is to the effect that the Keltic that thus intruded was not (as might be expected, *à priori*) the Keltic of the British, but the Keltic of the Erse or Gaelic branch. Upon the validity of this doctrine I suspend my judgment, having indicated an exception to it. Its bearings are, however, of great importance. According to the ordinary view of the population of the British Isles, the British was introduced into Britain from Gaul. The Gaelic, however, of Ireland and Scotland may have originated in Britain, or (if not) it may have been developed on the Continent, and trans-

planted to the soil anterior to the spread of the British. And this is (there or thereabouts) what Lhuyd's view makes it. Lhuyd's view makes the original population of all the British Isles—England as well as Scotland and Ireland—to have been Gaelic, Gaelic to the exclusion of any Britons whatever. It makes a considerable part of the continent Gaelic as well. In consequence of this, the Britons are a later and intrusive population, a population which effected a great and complete displacement of the earlier Gaels over the whole of South Britain, and the southern part of Scotland. Except that they were a branch of the same stock as the Gaels, their relation to the aborigines was that of the Anglo-Saxons to themselves at a later period. The Gaels first; then the Britons; lastly the Angles. Such is the sequence.

The general distribution of these two branches of the Keltic stock leads to Lhuyd's hypothesis; in other words, the presumptions are in its favour. But this is not all. There are certainly some words—the names, of course, of geographical objects—to be found in both England and Gaul, which are better explained by the Gaelic than the British language. The most notable of these are the names of such rivers as the *Exe*, *Axe*, and, perhaps, *Oose*, which is better illustrated by the Irish term *uisge* (*whiskey, water*), than by any Welsh or Armorican one.

Mr. Garnett and others, without adopting this view, have spoken of it with respect. Now Newman's doctrines concerning the Gaelic (rather than the British) affinities of the intrusive element of the Latin favour, rather than oppose, it. But is the doctrine itself unexceptionable? It has already been stated that an exception has been taken to it. What is the evidence that the Gaelic numerals are older than the introduction of Christianity into Ireland?

SECTION III.

SKETCH OF CHIEF WORKS—SPECIAL GERMAN AFFINITIES—DAVIES
—HOLMBOE.

Of course, if the Keltic tongues were Indo-European, they would have certain affinities with the German. How far were

these special? Something has been written upon this question,
the aspects of which are, *mutatis mutandis*, those of the last sec-
tion.

1. Given a certain number of elements common to the two
classes—which lent, which borrowed?

2. Given a certain number of elements common to both
classes, are they lent or borrowed at all? Are they not referrible
to some common tongue? Are they not Indo-European rather
than either Keltic or German?

In respect to the extent to which words decidedly belonging
to one tongue have been taken up in another, the peculiar rela-
tion of the British to the English is important. There is giving
and taking here, even where there is nothing of the kind else-
where. Upon this point, two papers, by the Rev. T. Davies, in
the Transactions of the Philological Society, are of importance.

1. On the races of Lancashire, as indicated by the local
names, and the dialect of the country. (Read Dec. 7, 1855).

2. On the connection of the Keltic with the Teutonic lan-
guages, and especially with the Anglo-Saxon. (Read Feb. 19,
and March 5, 1857.)

In these papers there is a waste of power on what may be
called the controversial points entailed upon Keltic philologues
by their predecessors. German affinities, as well as other
matters, have been over-stoutly maintained, over-stoutly denied.
Hence, on either side of the question, there is a certain amount
of apparent, or real, advocacy. As a fact in the history of
opinion, there is a great tendency to disconnect Kelts and Ger-
mans. As a fact, in the way of geography and ethnology, no
two classes are more reasonably presumed to be specially con-
nected. It would save much paper if the real *à priori* presump-
tions of the case itself, rather than the mere accidents of opinion,
regulated the arguments on either side.

As it is, however, the papers under notice give valuable
details in favour of the intrinsically probable doctrine that the
Keltic tongues have special German affinities, these being (as the
geography and ethnology also suggest) with the Low rather than
the High German division. The following extracts give some of
the more important lists :—

Related Words of a general or abstract kind.

A.S. *guð* (war, fight); *guð-bil* (war-bill, sword); *guð-bord* (warlike board, shield); O.N. *gudur* (battle); *guð* (id.)

W. *gwth* (push, thrust); *gwthio* (to push, thrust); *cad* (fight, battle); Gael. and Ir. *cath.*

A.S. *cwide, cwede* (speech, saying); *cweðan* (to speak, say); Goth. *qvithan* (to speak); O.H.G. *quedan, cheden*; O.N. *quedha*; Mid. Du. *quedden* (salutare).

Gael. *ceadal* (story, narrative); *ceadalach* (malicious, as a story); *guidh* (to beseech); W. *gwed* (utterance, saying); *gwedawl* (relating to speech); *gwedwr* (speaker).

A.S. *gabban* (to scoff, to delude); Dan. *gab* (mouth of a river, gap, opening); Du. *gabberen* (to prate).

Gael. *gab, gob* (bill, beak, mouth); *gabair* (tattler); W. *gwepio* (to grin, to mock); *gubain* (to howl); Bret. *gaber* (to banter); O.Fr. *gab* (raillery).

A.S. *frec* (bold, wicked, greedy); Germ. *frech*; O.H.G. *frochon*; Old Sax. *frocno* (audacter); O.N. *frækn* (strenuus); Goth. *friks* (avarus).

W. *ffroch* (furious fierce, ardent); *ffro* (violent motion or impulse); Gael. *friogh* (sharp, keen); *fear-gach* (enraged, furious).

Germ. *gruss* (salute, greeting), *grüssen*; A.S. *gretan, grætan*; Bav. *grüessen.*

W. *gresaw* (a welcome); *gresawu* (to welcome, to show hospitality), from *gres* (what is warm or cheering); *gresawl* (ardent, cherishing).

A.S. *grim* (fury, rage); *gram* (furious, fierce); Germ. *grimm*; Du. *grimmig* (angry, ill-natured); Dan. *grim* (stern, severe, sour).

Gael. *gruaim* (frown, surly look); *grim* (war, battle); W. *grem* (crashing of the teeth, snarl); W. *gremial* (to gnash, to snarl).

A.S. *helm* (covering, helmet, foliage); *helan* (to conceal, to cover); G. *helm, hüllen.*

W. *hul* (cover, coverlet); *hulio* (to cover, to spread over); *huliwr* (coverer, slater), pron. as the Eng. "hillier"=tiler.

A.S. *galwan* (to shout, to rejoice); *gælan* (to sing, to enchant); Prov. Germ. *gall* (sound); Du. *galm* (sound, noise, voice).

W. *galw* (to call, to invoke); Ir. and Gael. *glaodh* (to cry, to shout.)

A.S. *rynan* (to whisper, to tell secrets); *run* (letter, magical character, mystery); Germ. *rune* (runic letter). O.N. *rún* (rune, confidential talk).

W. *rhin* (a secret, a charm); *rhino* (to be mysterious, to use spells); Gael. *rùn* (secret, mystery).

Names of Animals.

A.S. *mearh, mearg* (horse); O.H.G. *mar, march*; O.N. *mar*; Bav. *merchen*; E. *mare*.

W. *march* (horse); *marchau* (to ride); *marchawr* (horseman, cavalier); Gael. and Ir. *marc* (horse); *marcair* (horseman); Bret. and Corn. *march*.

A.S. *nædre* (snake, adder); Goth. *nadrs*; Germ. *natter*; O.Sax. *nadere*.

W. *nadr, neidr* (snake); Gael and Ir. *nathair*; Corn. *nadder*.

A.S. *buc* (stag, buck); Germ. *bock* (buck, he-goat); Du. *bok* (he-goat).

W. *bwch* (a buck); also the male of several animals, as *bwch gafr* (he-goat); *bwch danas* (buck or male of deer), Pughe; Gael. and Ir. *boc*; Bret. *buch*; Corn. *bouch*.

A.S. *hana* (cock); Germ. *hahn*.

Gael. *eun* (bird, fowl): [the letter *h* is not used as an initial in Gaelic]; Ir. *id*.

A.S. *catt* (cat); Germ. *katze*; O. N. *kát-r*.

W. *cath, cathes* (female cat); Gael. and Ir. *cat*.

A.S. *steda* (horse, stallion); Eng. *steed*; Germ. *stute* (mare).

Gael. *steud* (a race, a horse); *steud-each* (race-horse); *steud* (to run swiftly)

A.S. *earn, ern* (eagle); O.H.G. *aro, arn, erni*; Du. *ár*; Goth. *ara*; O.N. *aern, ari*; Germ. *adler*.

W. *eryr*; Ir. *iolar*; Gael. *iolair*.

Miscellaneous.

A.S. *beost* (biestings, first milk of a cow after calving); Dan. *beest* (beast); Du. *beest*.

Gael. *beist, biast*; Ir. *biast*; Corn. *bêst*; W. *bwyst* (wildness, ferocity).

A.S. *mal* (toll); O.N. *mali* (pay); Germ. *mahl* (agreement).

W. *mal* (a separate particle, grinding, contribution, tax); Ir. and Gael. *mal, mail* (rent, tribute, tax); Bret. *mael* (gain).

A.S. *tol, toll,* (tax, tribute); Germ. *zoll.*

W. *toli* (to curtail, diminish, take from); *toll* (fraction, custom, or toll); *tolli* (to take a part from, to exact toll); *tollawr* (a tax gatherer).

A.S. *web* (web); *webban* (to weave); Germ. *webe, weben.*

W. *gwe* (web); *gweu, gwau* (to weave); *gwëad* (weaving, knitting); *gweadur* (weaver); Gael. *figh* (to weave, to plait); *fig-headair* (weaver, twister).

A.S. *balca* (ridge, beam, balk); Germ. *balken;* O.N. *bälkr* (fence); Dan. *biælke.*

W. *balc* (balk, ridge); *bal* (prominence); Gael. *balc* (ridge, boundary): Ir. *balc.*

A.S. *mand* (basket); Germ. and Du. *mand.*

W. *maned* (a hand-basket), from *mun* (a hand, Lat. *manus*); Gael. *man* (hand); Ir. *mana.*

A.S. *mur* (wall); Germ. *mauer;* Du. *muur;* also A.S. *weal* (wall); Germ. *wall;* Du. *wal.*

W. *mur* (a wall); *murio* (to fix, to establish, to build a wall); W. *gwall* (fence, rampart, wall); Gael. and Ir. *fal* (circle, fence, scythe, Lat. *falx*).

A.S. *flasc* (flask); Germ. *flasche;* Du. *fles.*

W. *fflasg* (a vessel of straw or wicker work, a basket); Gael. *flasg.*

A.S. *miln* (mill); Du. *molen;* Germ. *mühle.*

W. *melin,* from *melu* (to grind); Gael. *muilionn.*

A.S. *parruc* (park); Germ. *park* (park, warren).

W. *parc* (enclosure, field, park); *parcio* (to enclose, to hedge in); Gael. *pairc* enclosure, field); Ir. *id.*

A.S. *ræp, ráp* (rope); Du. *reep;* Sw. *rep;* Dan. *reeb.*

W. *rhaff* (a rope); Eng. *reef;* Ir. *ropa;* Gael. *róp.*

A.S. *panne* (pan); Du. *pan;* Germ, *pfanne.*

W. *pan* (pan, bowl, cup); Gael. *panna* (id); *pannag, bannag* (pancake)

A.S. *bát* (boat, ship); Du. *boot;* Dan. *baad;* Germ. *bot.*

W. *bad* (boat); *badwr* (boatman, sculler); Ir. *bad;* Gael. *bad.* [Pughe derives the word from *ba* (immersion, and also *badd* (bath), A.S. *bæð,* from the same root.]

A.S. *clucge* (bell); Germ. *klocke*; Du. and Fries. *klok*. — W. *clock* (bell); *clog* (bell, clock); Ir. *clog*.

A.S. *myse, mese* (table, dish); O.H.G. *mias, meas*; Goth. *mes*. — Gael. *mias* (a plate, dish); Ir. *mias*; Corn. *mius* (basket); Bret. *meuz*; W. *mwys* (basket, hamper).

Germ. *lohn* (wages, hire); Dan. *lön*. — Gael. *lòn* (provision, food)? Ir. *id.*; W. *lluniaeth* (formation, arrangement, providence, food); Lewis.

A.S *uloh* (wool); Germ. *wolle.* — Gael. and Ir. *olann*; W. *gwlan*.

Much of this and the like (for the extracts just given form but a small portion of the whole) is minute English philology rather than Kelto-German ethnography. The lists, however, are valuable contributions to the subject.

Out of England, a paper of Professor Holmboe's, of Christiania, has added to our knowledge of the special relations between the Kelt and German, although, like Newman, the author sees in many words evidence of the Keltic elements in the German being *intrusive;* not, however, to the exclusion of many words common to the two tongues originally. Holmboe's work is entitled Norsk og Keltisk; om Det Norske og de Keltiske Sprogs Inbyrdes Laan. (Christiania, 1854).

The Keltic is Indo-European, and, as such, German. Besides this, there are words lent and borrowed. They are from the Low German rather than the High, and from the Norse or Scandinavian rather than the Anglo-Saxon or Frisian. This is the doctrine of the Norwegian professor—right in the main. Several of his words are the same as Davies'. Davies, however, draws chiefly from the Anglo-Saxon; Holmboe from the Icelandic.

The Norse affinities had been previously indicated by Garnett. "Some philologists have expressed an opinion that the Scoti or Milesians were of Germanic race; or at all events had been subjected to Germanic admixture; and the language, as we now find it, certainly gives some countenance to that hypothesis. For example, *teanga* is the only word current for *tongue*, totally different from the Welsh *tavod;* and *leighis*, to heal, *leagh*, physical, are evident counterparts of our Saxon term *leech*. The following words, constituting a very small proportion of

what might be produced, may serve as further specimens of the
class :—

> Beit, both.
> Coinne, woman, quean.
> Daor, dear.
> Dorcha, dark.
> Dream, company, people ; A.S. truma ; O.E. trome.
> Drong, throng.
> Faigh, to get, obtain ; *Dan.* faae.
> Feacht, fight.
> Frag, woman, wife ; *Germ.* frau.
> Laire, thigh ; *Dan.* laar.
> Lagh, law.
> Lab, lip.
> Laoidh, poem, lay; *Germ.* lied.
> Lasd, loading, ballast; *Germ.* last.
> Leos, light ; *Isl.* lios.
> Lumhan, lamb.
> Sàr, very, exceeding ; *Germ.* sehr.
> Seadha, saw.
> Seal, a while, space of time ; A.S. sael, sel.
> Seam, a peg or pin ; *Dan.* söm, nail.
> Sgad, loss, misfortune ; *Dan.* skade.
> Sgaoil, separate, disperse ; *Sw.* skala.
> Sgeir, rock in the sea, skerry ; *Isl.* skèr.
> Sgarbh, a cormorant ; *Isl.* skarfr.
> Snaig, creep, *sneak.*
> Sneachd, snow.
> Sliochd, family, race; *Germ.* geschlecht.
> Slug, swallow; *Germ.* schlucken.
> Smachd, power, authority; *Germ.* macht.
> Smeoraich, smear.
> Snaidh, cut; *Germ.* schneiden.
> Spaisdrich, walk ; *Germ.* spazieren.
> Spàr, a beam or joist.
> Sreang, a string.
> Sreamh, a current, stream.
> Steagaim, parch, fry ; *Sw.* steka, to roast, fry, broil.
> Strith, strife ; *Germ.* streit.
> Trath, time, season ; A.S. thrag ; O.E. throw.

Some of the above terms may have been introduced in the
ninth and following centuries by the Northmen ; but many of
them occur in the oldest known monuments of the language ;
they are also accompanied by many compounds and derivatives,
which is commonly regarded as a proof of long naturalization ;

and are moreover current in Connaught, where the Danes never had any permanent settlement. One of the most remarkable indications of a Teutonic affinity is the termination *nas*, or *nis*, exactly corresponding to our *ness* in *greatness, goodness; ex. gr.* breithcam*nas*, judgment, fiadh*nis*, witness, etc. This affix is too completely incorporated in the language to be a borrowed term, and it moreover appears to be *significant*, in the sense of *state, condition*, in Irish, though not in German. As far as the writer knows, it is confined to the Gaelic and Teutonic dialects. The Irish *sealbh*, property, possession; *adj. sealbhach, proprius*, would also furnish a plausible origin for the German *selber, self*, a word which has no known Teutonic etymology."

SECTION IV.

SKETCH, ETC.—ENLARGEMENT OF THE SO-CALLED INDO-EUROPEAN CLASS.

If the Kelt be Indo-European, any additions made to the class so designated must enlarge the range of Keltic affinities. Such being the case, a great deal of work may be done illustrative of Kelt philology without being meant to be so; its action being indirect. Again, a great deal of indirect work of the same kind may be done consciously; the writer having a special view to the Kelt. In either case, additions are made to Kelt ethnography.

Akin to investigations of this kind, but more direct in its action, is the comparison of the Keltic tongues with languages other than Indo-European—the Keltic being the starting point, the illustration of Indo-European philology being subordinate. Much has been done in this way—much wisely, much hastily.

The old belief concerning the Eastern origin of the Kelts, as it stood before the word Indo-European was invented, and as it is given in pp. 72—78, has yet to die out.

Consequently, even cautious investigators have not only given a list of Semitic elements in the Keltic, but have made the Keltic specially Semitic.

Similar investigators, on the strength of similar lists, have made it Coptic.

Some have made it, more or less, African.

Albanian words have been pointed out in it.

So have Siberian; especially words from the Tungusian dialects; to say nothing of Lap, Ostiak, and the like.

The following list is Armenian. It is Mr. Garnett's. As many make the Armenian Indo-European, its place, perhaps, is, more properly, elsewhere. Exceptions, however, to this view have already been taken. (Note 8.)

ARMENIAN.		CELTIC.
dsiern	*hand*	G. W. dourn, dorn, *fist.*
khuir	*sister*	W. chwaer.
djur	*water*	W. dwr.
ardj	*bear*	W. arth.
dzarr	*tree*	— derw, *oak.*
mis	*flesh*	— mes, *dish, meal.*
datel	*to judge*	— dadlen, *to litigate.*
bari	*good*	Bret. brao; G. breagh.
pag-anel	*to salute*	W. G. pog, *a kiss.*
tun	*house*	G. dun, *a fort;* W. din.
phait	*wood*	G. fiadh; W. gwydd.
am	*year*	G. W. am, *time.*
oskr	*bone*	W. asgwrn.
gloukh	*head*	W. clog, in pen-glog; G. cloghan, *skull.*
sir	*love*	W. G. serch.
air	*man*	G. fear; W. gwr.
amis	*month*	W. mis.
lousin	*moon*	— lloer.
khoz	*swine*	— hwch.
arjat	*silver*	G. airgiod.
amarn	*summer*	— samhradh.
boun	*trunk, stock*	W. bon; G. bun.
i werah	*over, upon*	— gwor, gor; G. for.
kin	*woman*	G. coinne.
ter, *lord; gen.* tearan		W. teyrn.
khagzr	*sweet*	— chweg.
ail	*but*	G. ail, *other.* (*cf.* Gr. ἀλλά.)

It may also be added that Mr. Garnett is one of the few who have made special comparisons between the Keltic and Slavonic :

SLAVONIC.		CELTIC.
baba	*an old woman*	Ir. badhbh, *sorceress.*
blag	*good*	— breagh; Bret. brav.
blesk	*brightness*	— blosg, *light.*
blejat (Rus.)	*to bleat*	W. bloeddiaw, *to cry out.*
blato	*mud*	— llaid.
bodat (Rus.)	{ *to prick, to butt with the horns* }	— pwtiaw, *to butt, poke.*
borju	*I fight*	Ir. borr, *victory;* borras, *soldier.*
bran	*battle*	— braine, *captain, chief*
briju	*I shave*	W. byrrau, *to crop.*
bi'z	*quick*	— pres; Ir. brise; E. *brisk.*
briag	*bank, shore*	G. braighe; W. bre, *high ground;* Sc. brae.
vitaz	*conqueror*	W. buddyg.
vlaga	*moisture*	— gwlych; Ir. fliuch.
vladuïka	*ruler*	— gwledig; Ir. flaith.
vlas	*hair*	— gwallt; Ir. folt.
vl'k	*wolf*	Ir. breach.
vl'na	*wool*	W. gwlan; Ir. ollan.
vran	*raven, black*	Ir. bran, *raven, black;* W. bran, *raven.*
vriema, *gen.*	vriemene, *time*	Bret. breman, *now.*
varit, (Russ.)	*to boil*	W. berwi.
voz	*upwards;* vuisok, *high*	Ir. uas, *up;* nasal, *high, noble.*
v'rt	*garden*	— gort.
viera	*faith*	W. gwir; Ir. fior, *true.*
glava	*head*	— pen-glog; Ir. clogan, *skull.*
glas	*voice*	W. llais.
gor'kui	*bitter*	Ir. geur, *sour, sharp.*
grom	*thunder*	Bret. kurun (κεραυνός).
debel	*thick*	W. tew.
dlanï	*palm of the hand*	W. G. dourn.
dl'g	*debt*	Ir. dlighe; W. dyled.
dol	*valley*	W. dol.
drozd, drozg	*thrush*	— tresglen.
dïbrï	*valley*	— dyffryn.
zima	*winter*	— gauav, *anciently* gaem.
kash'lí	*cough*	G. cas; W. pas.
kobuila	*mare*	— capull; W. keffyl, *horse.*
kolieno	*knee*	— glun; W. glin.
kovatz	*smith*	W. gov.
kradu	*I steal*	G. creachaim.
kr'vï	*blood*	W. crau (Lat. cruor).
krag (Polish)	*circle*	— crwn, *round.*
liek	*medicine*	Ir. leigheachd.
lag	*grove*	W. llwyn (Rom. λογγός).
mal	*little*	— mal, *small, light.*
minu	*I pass*	— myned, *to go.*

SLAVONIC.		CELTIC.
ml'zu	*I milk*	Ir. blighim.
more	*sea*	W. G. mor.
mas	*flesh*	W. mes, *a meal ;* E. mess.
rad	*willing*	— rhad, *free, gratuitous.*
panï (Illyr)	*trunk of a tree*	— bon ; Ir. bun.
rouno	*fleece*	W. rhawn ; Ir. ron, *hair of animals.*
salo	*fat*	Ir. saill.
slob	*weak, infirm*	W. clov.
slava	*glory*	Ir. cliu (Gr. κλέos).
slug	*servant*	— sgolog (Ger. schalk).
slied	*footstep*	— sliocht (E. slot).
snieg	*snow*	— sneacht.
soloma (Rus.)	*straw*	W. calav.
son (Rus.)	*sleep*	G. suain.
such	*dry*	W. sych.
srzde	*heart*	G. cridhe.
srieda	*middle*	W. craidd.
tuin	*hedge*	G. dun, *fort.*
cherv	*worm*	— crumh.
shirok	*broad*	— sir, long.
shui	*left, sinister*	W. aswy."

What are we to say to all this? That the resemblances are accidental? No. That the lists are wrong? There is, doubtless, some error; since no one who uses languages by the dozen or score avoids them. On the whole, however, the facts are right.

They are not facts, however, in special Keltic ethnology. They are simply contributions to the proof of the great general theorem that languages all over the world are more alike than many suppose them to be.

SECTION V.

SKETCH, ETC., ARRANGEMENT, AND DETAILS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE KELTIC CLASS ITSELF.

Upon these much has been written, though not in systematic works. The greater part of the lucubrations in this direction has been subordinate to the illustration of some other subject.

Thus the historians of Gaul, England, and Italy, have all a great deal to say about some Kelt population or other. So have the historians of some portion of Germany. The geographer and ethnologist are in the same predicament with the historian ; not to mention the philologue, who, if he write about the English or French, must recognize a Keltic element. Is this large or small? What does it represent? Supposing it to be large, is the infusion of Keltic blood in the veins of the population proportionate? or, is the language more (or less) Keltic than the blood? or is the blood more (or less) Keltic than the language? Are the English pure Germans or only half-bloods? Are the French half-bloods or Romans? How much also is German? Which are the most Keltic parts of the country? Which of England? Supposing either or both of these populations to be ever so Keltic (or ever so Roman or German), what is the value of the fact? Is it a difference of race? What is race? Were the Kelts ever less Keltic than they are at present? Was there ever anything transitional between them and the Germans? Was nation *a* or nation *b* of antiquity, Kelt or German? or was it neither the one nor the other?

These questions and the like have been discussed, and the writings on them have been various.

"Sunt bona, sunt quædam mediocria."

It is scarcely necessary, nor is it easy, to enumerate them. It is more convenient, and quite as useful, to indicate the chief subjects that have commanded attention—

1. *The details of the Gallo-German frontier.*—The consideration of these falls into two divisions—

a. The position of certain populations of the Rhine, the Treviri and the like.

b. The position of the Belgæ.

2. *The position of the Picts.*

3. *The position of the old language of Gauls.*—Was it British or Gaelic? One of the first of Mr. Garnett's valuable papers on the Language of the British Isles (in the Philological Transactions) deals with this question.

4. *The Language of Britain.*—Was this British or Gaelic?

5. *The present Armorican.*—Did this come from Wales?

6. *The present Welsh.*—Did this come from Armorica? The doctrine of Mr. Wright on this point has been already noticed.

The *pro*'s and *con*'s in all these problems are indicated in different sections of either the text or notes. Not one of them is settled to the satisfaction of all enquirers. In the mind of the present writer the Kelt origin of the Belgæ is the most certain of the whole list. Yet many make them German. On the opposite side, no one has written better than Dr. Prichard himself, in his Natural History of Man, in the chapter on the ethnology of Gaul and Belgium.

SECTION VI.

SKETCH, ETC.—WRITINGS OF GARNETT—ZEUSS—DIEFFENBACH.

The chief writings that, either by suggestions, special investigations, or the exposition of known facts, have advanced Keltic ethnology, now come under notice; and first and foremost amongst them, the writings of the philologue so often quoted— Mr. Garnett. These have touched upon the grammatical structure, the ethnological relations of the stock in general, and the details of its constituent elements. With the exception of the contribution to the Quarterly Review, noticed in p. 285, all Mr. Garnett's dissertations are in the Transactions of the Philological Society.

1. The oblique character of the pronouns of the persons of verbs is his palmary contribution to philology—to philology, however, rather than to ethnology.

2. His other notices are—

a. In favour of the language of ancient Britain being that of ancient Gaul, and of both being British rather than Gaelic.

b. In favour of the Picts having been Britons rather than either Gaels or Germans.

c. In illustration of the affinities of Keltic tongues with the German, Slavonic, and other undoubted members of the Indo-European stock, and with the Albanian, Armenian, and other branches beyond it.

None of these comparisons are driven to the undue extent of making the Keltic specially Armenian, specially Albanian, specially anything. It is simply, in Mr. Garnett's hands, what Prichard left it—a language decidedly akin to the Latin, Greek,

German, Slavonic, and Sanskrit, and more or less allied to certain languages beyond the pale of the class to which these belonged.

And here I may be allowed to express the hope, not only that Mr. Garnett's papers on the Keltic tongues, but that *all* his writings upon philological subjects, may be published. They are by far the best works in comparative grammar and ethnology of the century.

The earliest contributions to Keltic philology, by Kaspar Zeuss, are to be found in the third chapter of his valuable work on the Germans and the Neighbouring Tribes (Die Deutsche und die Nachbarstamme), under the words *Kelten, Belgæ, Britanni, Hibernische,* etc.

As Garnett demands a publisher, Zeuss calls for a translator— for the work under notice at least. His more specific lucubrations are in Latin, and, so being, are more accessible. Individually, my obligations to his learning and industry are beyond compute. It is with a sense of actual pain that, whilst opposing his conclusions, I have here and elsewhere availed myself of his facts. In thinking of this, I feel myself one of the most ungrateful of writers. Like the present premier, when he takes the oath that excludes Hebrew tax-payers and millionaire loan-contractors from an English House of Commons, I " blush inwardly."

In his last, and more decidedly Keltic work, the Grammática Celtica, Zeuss relies chiefly on the *data* he has himself seen, and he seems to have looked about for them. Of the Irish he makes much ; for, with praiseworthy caution—with no more caution, however, than the intricate nature of the subject demands—he draws a clear and definite distinction between the matter and the form of the materials he has to deal with. He acts upon the safe rule, that the age of the language is to be measured by the age of the writing which conveys it to posterity. It cannot, of course, be younger than this. Even if younger than the MS. in which it is found, it is not, and cannot be, younger than the man who wrote, and the pen and ink wherewith it was written. But may it not be older ? It may, and it may not. It may, if a poem, have been composed by a bard long since dead, and written on the particular MS. on which we find it, by some copyist of a later age. But, granting that this is the case, what security has the modern critic that the language may not be that of the copyist instead of the original composer ? Experience tells us

that accommodations of the kind here implied are common, both in the matter of time and place; both in respect to the stage in which a language appears, and the dialect in which it is embodied.

Hence we get the good rule, that, in all cases of obscure and fragmentary literature, the age of the M.S. is the *maximum* age of the language it preserves. Zeuss acts on this, and he acts wisely. To works like the Laws of Howel Dha, and the Mabinogion, he gives, as far as the matter and the date of their composition goes, a comparatively high antiquity. To the grammatical forms, and to their orthography, he gives the antiquity of the parchment on which they are written, certainly nothing higher, possibly something lower.

With this rule for the definition of antiquity, he gives a preference to the Irish over the Welsh. The facts connected with the former are certainly interesting. They show the extent to which the Irish monks were employed, actively, and apparently successfully, on the diffusion of the light of the Gospel in countries far beyond the seas that encompassed Ireland. They indicate the presence of disciples and successors of St. Columban, in Switzerland, on the Rhine, in Bavaria, in Belgium, and in France. One monk gets as far as Kief, and back again. They show that monastery after monastery contained Irish inmates— few or many—sometimes called Angles, or Saxons, but more generally Scots.

I confess that, after no trifling amount of discursive and miscellaneous reading, amongst an eminently discursive and miscellaneous mass of books appertaining to ancient Ireland and its civilization, Christianity, and influence—reading, which had struck me as much more tending to the glorification of Hibernia, and things Hibernian, than to any useful criticism, the hard, though isolate and fragmentary facts, in the way of Irish learning, and Irish migratory zeal, that these notices conveyed, raised my opinion of the early missionaries of Christianity much more than the accounts of their vaunted learning and doubtful civilization with which the ordinary over-patriotic histories teem.

The MSS. for the earliest Irish, quoted by Zeuss, are the following :—

The glosses on Priscian.—These are in the library of St. Gallen. They are marginal and interlinear; written in three hands. A few are in the Ogham character; the majority in the

ordinary Latin. The seventh century is the assigned date of these glosses on Priscian.

The glosses of the Codex Paulinus.—This is a MS. in the library of the University, originally of the Cathedral of Wirtzburg. They apply to the Epistles of St. Paul. The Pauline glosses are not older, though possibly as old as the Priscian.

The Milan glosses.—These are a Commentary on the Psalms, rightly or wrongly ascribed to St. Jerome. They are, perhaps, as old as the preceding.

The glosses on Beda, in the Carlsruhe Library.—Somewhat later than the Milan, Wirtzburg, and St. Gallen MSS.

The Carlsruhe glosses on Priscian.—In some parts these are based upon the St. Gallen MS., or, at any rate, originate in a common source. In others they are independent.

The St. Gallen Incantations, or formulæ for effecting charms; more or less metrical, if not poetical, in character.

The Codex Camaracensis. — This contains Canones Hiberni Concilii, A.D. 684. The MS., however, belongs to the ninth century.

Of works of equal antiquity with these (the test being as above), in the British division of the Keltic tongues, Zeuss gives fewer for Wales than for Ireland. They are :—

WELSH.

1. *Codex Oxoniensis prior* (Bodleian, originally NE. D. 2. 19, now F. 4. 4—32), containing glosses on Eutychius and Ovid's Ars Amandi, also the alphabet of *coelbren y beirdd*, along with *De mensuris et ponderibus quædam, Cambrica intermixta laterus*, pp. 22^h—23^a.

2. *Codex Oxoniensis posterior* (Bodleian, originally NE. B. 5. 9, now MS. Bodl. 572), membranaceus, formæ minoris, res theologicas continens, in medio autem; and p. 41^b, usque ad 47^h persa quædam Latina ad præbendam pueris verborum copiam (ut videtur) cum vocibus Cambricis, quæ scriptæ sunt aut supra vocabula latina aut post ea in linea cum signo i. glossatorum solito.

3. *Codex Ecclesiæ Lichfeldensis* (antea Landavensis). The Gospels, with certain entries of donations made to the Cathedral of Landaff—adnotatæ sunt Latine, sed cum nominibus vel etiam sententiis Cambricis. Published by Wanley.

4. *Folium Luxemburgense.* Published by Mone, in Die Gallische Sprache. Karlsruhe, 1851.

5. *Liber Landavensis.*

6. *Codex Legum Venedotianus.*—The Laws of Howell Dda. Vetustior omnibus legum codicibus qui extant.

7. *Codex Ruber Hergestensis* (*the Red Book of Hergest*). In the library of Jesus College. Intermediate between the Old and Middle British.

CORNISH.

1. The Cotton MSS., British Museum, Vesp. A. 14.
2. *Carmen de Passione Christi.*

ARMORICAN.

1. Glosses in the Chartularies of the Monasteries of Rhedon and Landevin.

2. Vita S. Nonnæ, or (Nonitæ). A mystery of the twelfth century. Published as the *Buhez santez Nonn,* with an Introduction by the Abbé Sionnet, and with a literal translation by M. Legonidec. Paris, 1837.

He concludes with a notice, which the next chapter will explain—quæ apud Marcellum Burdigalensem, Virgilium Grammaticum, in glossa Malbergica leguntur peregrina, inaudita vel incognita, si quis quæsiverit in hoc opere, non inveniat: in his omnibus enim equidem nec inveni vocem Celticam nec invenio.

Dieffenbach's Celtica, published in '39 and '40, at Stuttgard, is valuable in respect to the number of glosses it contains, and, also, for the amount of information upon other points of Kelt ethnology.

SECTION VII.

SKETCH, ETC. — SPECULATIONS AND CONTROVERSY — THE MALBERG GLOSSES—LEO—MEYER—MONE—HOLTZMANN.

I am not aware of any writer of authority having attempted to reverse the statement of Prichard as to the fact of the Keltic languages belonging to the so-called Indo-European class, especially since its confirmation and adoption by Bopp and Pictet. In the possibility, however, of its being, at the same time, Indo-

European and something else, lies the germ of any amount of speculation. There is the germ, too, of any amount of speculation in the questions concerning the details of the Keltic name. What were the Belgæ, etc.? There is the germ too of any amount of speculation in respect to the route taken by the Welsh and Gaels in their journey from Asia to Europe, — for from Asia (by hypothesis) they came. If any one, besides myself, has steadily and consistently ignored their Eastern origin, and made them simple Europeans of the West of Europe, the fact is unknown to me.

Where there is speculation, there is also controversy; hence the heading of the present chapter.

Into these speculations and controversies able men have entered; and, when able men write, some result or other is the consequence. They may be wrong. Nevertheless, they ventilate the subject, and suggest ideas.

The chief point, however, which the very equivocal works of the present chapter illustrate, is the state of the philological mind in Germany. In England, etymology (as we are told by the scholars of Germany, and as many of us tell ourselves) is less of a science than it is capable of being made. On the contrary, it is conjectural, empirical; sensible, perhaps, in its best form; but still empirical and conjectural. In the clever manipulation of letters, in the doctrine of Ablaut, and Anlaut, and Inlaut, and Lautverwechselung, and Lautverschiebung, and the like compounds of Laut, we are less *au fait* than our neighbours. The consequence is, that, in Great Britain, loose etymology, and looser ethnology, is nothing more than what we expect. In Germany, however, philology has its laws—is a science. As a consequence of this, the loose conjectures of any old and vicious school in philology are exploded, obliterated, dead and buried, never more to rise. Loose conjectures in *any* school are exploded—the loose conjectures of the old Keltic school most especially.

Such is the theory. The practice is widely different. If the so-called laws of the letter-changes are worth the paper on which they are written, they are worth something as safeguards against illegitimate ingenuity and eccentric conjecture; against all those unsatisfactory uncertainties which have brought discredit on the study of most languages, and on that of the Keltic most especially. So far, however, are they from having exhibited any conservative or cautionary qualities, that the men

whose results most nearly approach those of the Keltic scholars of the last century, are precisely those whose mastery over the alphabet, in the way of letter-change, is the greatest.

The chief point, then, which the following works illustrate is the insufficiency of the so-called Laws of Letter-change as a safeguard against uncertainty and eccentricity.

The work of Leo, upon the Malberg glosses (Malbergische Glossen, Halle '42), is to the effect that certain glosses upon a copy of the Lex Salica are Belgian and Kelt. The meaning of the word Malberg is uncertain. There is no evidence of its being the name of a place; none of its being that of a man. The syllable *malb-* and *malberg-* precedes several of the glosses. Hence the use of the term. Leo's doctrine, that these glosses were Keltic, was soon controverted—by Clement, at first, afterwards by Grimm, and others. The opinion of Zeuss is given in the extract of the preceding chapter. One of the most suggestive portions of Leo's work is the following list :—

LATIN.	GAELIC.	LATIN.	GAELIC.
anima	anam	cella (tem-plum)	ceall
aurum	or		
argentum	airgoit	cingulum	ceangal
amnis	amhuin	caccare	cac-
alius	all	circulus	cearcall
agere	ac-	cornu	corn
aer	aer	caput	ceap
alere	al-	quinque	cuignear
angor (subst.)	anngur	quid ?	ciod
agnus	uaghn	quaestio	ceasd (quaerere, ceasg)
acer	acar, achear		
ager	acar	quantitas	caindigheacht
annulus	ainne	quando	can
armentum	airmheadh	quatuor	ceatair
arare	ar-	qualitas	cailidheacht
arduus	ard	caterva	ceatarbh
bonus	bonn, buan	certus (justus, fidelis)	ceart
bos	bo		
brachium	braic	cera	ceir
balbus	balbh	cista	ciste
betula	beith	coma	ciamh
caro (carnis)	carna	cluere	clu-, cluis-
coecus	caoc	clavus	clo
celare	ceil-	credere	creid-
coelum	ceal	copiae	coib, coip

LATIN.	GAELIC.	LATIN.	GAELIC.
causa	cáis	heros	earr
caulis	coilis	fallere	feall
calo	ciola, giola	falsus	falsa
cortex	coirt, cort, cart	fanum	fan
		fagus	feagha
corbis	carb	ferre	beir-
columba	colum	femina	femen
columna	columan	frater	brathair
communis	coimin	fidelis	feidil
cumulare	comhal	ferrum	iern, iarrun
canere	can-	granum	gran
clinare (inclinare)	claon-	galea	galia
		gignere	gin-
canna	gainne	grex	gragh, graidh, greigh
canis	cu (in obl. cas. cuin)		
		garrire	giorac
corpus	corp	gladius	cladhmh, cloidhimh
canabis	cnaib, canaib		
carrus	carra, carr	hyems	geimhre
cor (cordis)	croidhe	hora	uair
caballus	cabal, capall	hortus	gort
cura	car	ira	ir
cuniculus	cuinin	insula	inis
capere	gabh	lorica	luireach
caper	gabhar	lac	lachd, laith
clamor	glaim	lectum	leacht (grab-lager)
cucullus	cuach		
catus	cat	legere	leigh-
crocus	croch	lana	olann
calx (kalk)	cailc	luna	luan
caseus	caise	licere	leig
calvus	calbh	laena	léan
carus	cara	linum	lin
candela	cainneal	luscus	lusca
capo	cabun	locus	loc
caula	cobhail -	lacus	loch
corrumpere	coirip	latus	leathan
corrigere	coirigh	meretrix	meirdreach
centum	ceat	mos	mos
dare	doigh-	mel	mil
durus	diur	mons	moin
domus	dom	miles	mileadh
decem	deich	manus	main, mana
deus	dia	mater	mathair
bis (für duis)	dis	mutus	muite
duo	do	memoria	meamhoiri
equus	each	mensis	mios

LATIN.	GAELIC.	LATIN.	GAELIC.
mens	mein	scopulus	scealp
miscere	measg-	scutum	sciath
malitia	mailis	scrinium	scrin
mola	mol	scrutari	scrud-
macula	machuil	scopa	scuab
mille	mile	stare	sdad-
modus	modh	sex	se
mare	muir	septem	seacht
nidus	nid	senis	sean
numerus	niumhuir	sequor	seich-
nebula	neabhul	saliva	seile
novem	nao	signum	sighin
novus	no	sigillum	sigle
notus (clarus, insignis)	cno	siccare	sioc-
		sensus	siunsa
nox	nocht	soror	siur
nux	cnudh, cnu	sugere	sagh-
opus	obuir	sonus	son
ovis	aodh	somnus	suaimhneas
ovum	obh	stannum	stan
orare	or-	salix	sail (dimin. saileog)
octo	ocht		
oleum	ola	sol	sul
pes	cos	sedere	suidh-
pluma	clumh	secale	seagal
prudens	cruite	saltare	saltr—sealtr
purpura	corcur	taurus	tarbh
portus	port	tilia	teile
poena	pian	tyrannus	tiarua
plenus	lan	timor	time
planum	lana	tres	tri
lex (rectum)	reacht	tribus	treabh
rigidus	righin	tellus	tealla, teallur
rex	righ, ris	terra	tir
remigare	ramhaich	unus	aon
rota	roth	unguis	ionga, lang, ung, unga
rosa	ros		
saccus	sac	ungere	ung-, ong
sagitta	saighiot	unere	ur (das feuer)
sanus	saine	vinum	fion
suavis	saimh	vir	fear (in obl. casus: fir)
satietas	saith		
sal	salann	verus	fior
con-solari	solas-	vicus	fich
similis	samhail	verbum	fearb
simul	iomaille	vespera	feascor
scapha	scafa	vilis	feile

LATIN.	GAELIC.	LATIN.	GAELIC.
vita	bith, beatha	vates	faidh
vallum	fal	vagina.	faigin.
vulpes	uulp		

Dr. Meyer, in his paper on the Importance of the study of the Celtic Language, as exhibited in the Modern Celtic dialects still extant (*Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1847), thinks (*inter alia*) that "The Celtic nation transported itself from Asia, and more particularly from Asiatic Scythia, to Europe, and to this country, by two principal routes, which it resumed at different epochs, and thus formed two great streams of migration, flowing, as it were, periodically. The one in a south-western direction, proceeding through Syria and Egypt, and thence along the northern coast of Africa, reached Europe at the Pillars of Hercules, and passing on through Spain to Gaul, here divided itself into three branches, the northern of which terminated in Great Britain and Ireland, the southern in Italy, and the eastern, running along the Alps and the Danube, terminated only near the Black Sea, not far from the point where the whole stream is likely to have originated. The other great stream, proceeding in a more direct line, reached Europe at its eastern limit, and passing through European Scythia, and from thence partly through Scandinavia, partly along the Baltic, through Prussia (the Polena of the Sagas, and Pwyl of the Triads), and through Northern Germany, reached this country, and hence the more western and northern islands across the German Ocean, or *hazy sea*. Of these two streams or lines of Celtic migration, which, with reference to this country, we may distinguish by the names of the *western* and *eastern* stream, the former, although the less direct, seems to be the more ancient in history, and to have reached this country several centuries before the other. The principal nations belonging to it are the Κέλται of Spain (to whom this name particularly refers) and the *Galli*, the latter being the parent stock of the three tribes which successively possessed this island, and successively bestowed upon it the three names by which it is mentioned in the records of classical and national literature. Each of these names corresponds with that of the tribe itself, both being taken from the chief god worshipped by each tribe, on whom they always bestowed a two-fold character, one general, as god of the sun, and one special, as

their own warlike leader and protector—their *heros eponymus*. These three tribes are the following :—

" 1st. The Alwani (Alauni Alani), who took their name from their god *Alw*, and after him called this island *Alw-ion* (*Αλυυἴων*, Albion) ; *i.e.* the island of Alw.

" 2nd. The *Aedui*, who took their name from their god *Aed* (the Aedd Mawr of the triads), and after him called this island *Aeddon* or *Eiddyn* (Edin), a name preserved in that of the town of Edinburgh (Welsh. *Caer*, or Dinas Eiddyn ; Gælic, Din Eidin). The name under which the Aedni of Great Britain and Ireland are most frequently quoted, and which, contrasted with the other, may be called their secular name, is that of the Brigantes (identical with the Welsh family name Brychan, and the Irish Breoghan), and to be derived from the Welsh word *brych*, Gælic *breag*, fuscus.

" 3rd. The *Britons* (Brython), who took their name from their god Bryt or Pryd (the Prydyn ap Aedd Mawr of the Triads), and after him called this island Brytain (Ynys Prydain), Great Britain."

Mone finds the Kelts all over Europe ; in Germany, in Sarmatia, in Greece, in Italy (See *Celtische Forschungen zur Geschichte Mitteleuropas*, 1857).

Holtzmann, on the other hand, makes the Kelts of Gaul to have been Germans, writing very loosely and very rudely ; indeed, it is worth remarking that, in proportion as their criticism runs wild, the courtesy of the writers decreases. Keltomaniac and Teutonomaniac are common terms in the philological arena of Germany. Yet Mone, Holtzmann, and Meyer are, in all probability, greater adepts in letter-changes and the like than any scholar in Great Britain either is or cares to be.

SECTION VIII.

PRESENT CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL ETHNO-GRAPHY OF THE KELTS.

The remarks of the preceeding sections, and, more especially the last, shew that the writer by no means thinks well of

the present state of Kelt scholarship.   In Germany, where the
rules and cautions involved in the so-called laws of the letter-
changes are the most carefully studied, the licence of specu-
lation is the wildest.   There is something worse than mere bad
manners in writers calling one another Keltomaniacs, and Teu-
tonomaniacs.   There is the evidence of certain opinions having
taken a very extreme form.   There is, also, the still more decided
evidence to one of these two extremes being wrong.   One *must*,
both *may* be so.

Whether the clever manipulation of letter-changes has, by en-
abling men to go wrong according to system, done as much harm
as it is destined to do, is doubtful.   It is pretty certain that it
has done, almost, all the good of which it is capable.   For all
useful purposes Prichard used it, the results being what we have
seen.   It is not, then, from this quarter that any advancement
of Kelt ethnology is to be expected.

An improved logic, and a greater sobriety of idea, combined
with a great breadth of view, are the real desiderata, at least, for
the settlement of the more general questions.

An improved logic, combined with a greater sobriety of idea,
is especially needed for the separation of the two questions in-
volved in the title and contents of the present work.   All that is
legitimately deduced from any amount whatever of similarity
between a language spoken on the Shannon, and a language
spoken on the Ganges, is a connection between the two.   The
nature of this connection is a separate problem.   If writers con-
fuse the two, they only shew their own one-sidedness of view.

Out of several alternatives they see but one.   If Dr. Prichard
had written on the "Western Origin of the Sanskrit Language,"
learned men in Bombay and Calcutta would have accused him,
off-hand, of an undue amount of assumption.   Might not the
Keltic have originated in the East?   Might not both Keltic and
Sanskrit have been propagated from some intermediate point?
Is not the Indus as far from the Severn, as the Severn from the
Indus.   All this might have been asked, and that legitimately.
Mutatis mutandis, all this should be asked now.   That certain
things western, and certain things eastern are connected is true.
That the origin of the connection is in Asia is an assumption.
The first step towards an advancement, then, in Kelt ethnology
is to separate the questions.   The result *may be* what it now

is (for this, though I have decided it for myself, I do not pretend to prejudge for others), or it may be something different; only let the two questions be separated.

An improved logic, combined with a greater sobriety of idea, is necessary for the investigation of the Kelt area of Europe. That nations may bear similar, and even identical names, without being allied, has been shewn. The inference is that some of the Keltæ and Galatæ of antiquity may have been as different from the Gauls of Gallia, as a modern Gallician of Spain is different from a modern Gallician of Austria. What occurs at the present moment in the way of identity of name and difference of ethnological character may have occured two thousand years ago. The full bearing of this should be admitted and acted on.

An improved logic, combined with a greater breadth of view, should regulate all the conclusions that rest upon a certain amount of similarity between the Keltic, and languages like the Hebrew, Coptic, Albanian, etc. It is not a question as to whether there is, or is not, a certain amount of resemblance; but a question as to what that resemblance implies. Does it denote any special affinity? or, does it merely denote those general relations which all languages bear to each other? In most (probably in all) cases, similarities of the kind in question are merely so much evidence to the unity of language in general.

I have spoken of an improved logic; I might have said something about an improvement of the spirit and temper in which such a logic should be applied. The miserable spirit of partizanship, however, which delights in the contrast between the Kelt and Anglo-Saxon (each glorified at the expence of the other, according to the nationality of the writer), scarcely deserves notice in scientific works. The self-satisfied German, the susceptible Kelt of the journals and the platforms, may be left to the enjoyment of their own extreme forms of eccentric ethnology.

"Non ragiamo di lor, mai guard' e passa."

Let men write about England and Wales, without dragging in the somewhat equivocal history of the successes of the so-called Anglo-Saxon race in the old and new worlds.

That these negative rules, if adhered to, will do more to promote Kelt ethnology than all the letter-changes of the great continental philologues I firmly believe. But something more than

mere negations is wanted.   The specific comparisons most likely
to be productive of results may be indicated.

The fact of the Keltic being the language of the extreme
west is one of no little importance.   It simplifies investigation by
making certain affinities impossible.   Beyond the Hebrides, and
the coast of Galway, there is nothing but the mythic Atlantis in
which either affinities, or an approach to affinities, can be found
or dreamed of.   Whatever else the Gaelic may be, it is not of
western origin.

On the east, north, and south, there are two languages with
which its immediate geographical contact is undeniable—the
Basque and the German.   This it was, as the language of Gallia,
as the language of its original site, and, not as the language of
any migratory, intrusive, or conquering population.   Simply as
the Gallic of Gaul, it had a certain amount of Basque or Iberic
on its southern, a certain amount of German on its eastern,
northern, or north-eastern frontier.

As few, however, have held that the German and Basque lan-
guages were ever conterminous, other languages, besides these
two, must have helped to form the original Keltic frontier,
which lay within the present kingdom of Piedmont, Switzerland,
the Tyrol, and the non-German districts of the Upper Rhine.
What these were is a matter upon which much speculation may
be expended, and much difference of opinion maintained.   In-
deed, one of the mere preliminaries is a question of vast range
and many phases.   This is the question—Whether the earlier ex-
istence of some group of dialects, now extinct, is, or is not,
to be assumed.   Assume it, and there is no end to the com-
plications and doubts which may arise.   Assume it, and the
natural obscurity of this, and similar questions, increases.   But
let it be argued that what is called the rule of Parsimony
is opposed to the assumption.   Let the doctrine, that causes
are not to be multipled unnecessarily, have its full weight.   In
this case the problem lies within narrower bounds, and some
stock already in existence is the fact with which we have to
deal.

The present writer adheres entirely, and without reserve, to
this latter view ; as well on the strength of the facts with which
he is supplied *à posteriori*, as on the *à priori* rule by which he
regulates the argument.   So doing, he sees only two other lan-

guages, which, *at the first view*, claim notice — the Northern Latin in its oldest form, and the Western Slavonic. The first may have reached sufficiently far in the direction of Gaul to have touched some portion of the Keltic area, or, *vice versâ*, some portion of the Keltic area, may have touched upon Italy. The Ligurian, probably, did this.

The Slavonic is held by few to have been in immediate contact with anything Kelt. Nevertheless, an exceedingly strong case can be made out in favour of the forms of speech at present represented by the Czekh of Bohemia, and the Serb of Lusatia, having extended as far westward as the Rhine. If so, the western boundary of the Keltic of Gallia was German on the Upper, Slavonic on the Lower, Rhine. The direct affinities of the Kelt and Slavonic have been greatly overlooked. Few Slavonic scholars knew either Welsh or Irish; few Kelts either Polish or Bohemian; whereas, the numbers of both who know either English or German are high. No wonder, then, that the accidental circumstances noticed in a previous chapter have determined the opinion of learned men towards the belief that the Slavonic is one of the languages with which the Keltic is connected, indirectly rather than directly.

Now, none of these frontiers—Basque, German, Latin, or Slavonic—imply any very high antiquity, or any inordinate amount of movement and migration. Neither do they point to those very early times when the geographical relations of the different languages of Europe were notably different from what they are at present. On the contrary, they belong to the beginning of the historic period—say to the time of Julius Cæsar, or (more roundly and conveniently still) to the beginning of the Christian era. They belong to the state of things as it stood 1800 years ago.

What, however, if (say), 1000 years before, the German language lay more inland, the Keltic more to the north, the Fin of Livonia, Courland, and East Prussia, more to the west and south? In such a case the northernmost specimens of the Keltic, and the south-western Fin, may have been in contact. I do not say that this is the case. I only say that, in case the Fin elements in the Keltic, or the Kelt elements in the Fin, be found to be numerous enough to justify the doctrine of a special affinity, the possibility of an ordinary geographical contact must be borne in mind. Now Fin affinities being abundant in Keltic, the only

question is as to their nature. Are they general or special?
They may very easily be special.[1]

The reasons for their being this are foreshadowed in the re-
marks upon the Kelt frontier. Common sense tells us that the
closest affinities of a given language are likely to lie in the
closest geographical contact. When this is not the case, there
have generally been intrusions and displacements of some kind.
That such is often the case is well known. At the same time, as
a general rule, the first comparisons should be made with the
frontager languages. If this be done, our results, though
common-place in their character, will, most probably, be true.
If this be done, fewer discoveries will be made; but those few
will be real. If this be done, comparative philology will have
fewer brilliant points;—the brightness, however, such as it is,
will be that of the true rather than the false diamond. Common
sense, and a clear view of the à priori presumptions, are the
nine parts of the law in ethnology.

The frontager tongues, then, of the Keltic area first demand
notice. Of this there is no doubt. Whether they are exactly
the tongues that are here enumerated, viz. the Latin, Slavonic,
German, Basque, and Fin (?), is an open question. It is only
certain that it is not with these that the majority of the com-
parisons have, hitherto, been made.

That this is not the direction in which the common and
current comparisons have been made, is clear from what has
preceded. For one writer who has looked at the Serb or
Bohemian, twenty have troubled themselves about the Hebrew

---

[1] The following forms of the ordinal numerals are interesting; the Ostiak
being the Ugrian of the river Oby:

ENGLISH.	WELSH.	OSTIAK.
Second	deu-*ved*	ki-*met*
Third	tri-*ved*	kyt-*met*
Fourth	pedwar-*ved*	net-*met*
Fifth	pum-*med*	vet-*met*
Sixth	gwech-*ved*	kyda-*met*
Seventh	seith-*ved*	tavet-*met*
Eighth	wyth-*ved*	nida-*met*
Ninth	naw-*ved*	ap-yong-*met*
Tenth	deg-*ved*	yong-*met.*

In Sirianian and Wotiak the forms are *öd* and *äti.* Thus *fifth* = wit-*öd*
(S), and vit-*äti* (W). On the other hand, however, there is reason for believ-
ing that an *m* has been lost, since the Wotiak for *third* is küin'-*mäti.*

and Phenician. The Fin affinities have been noticed incidentally. The Basque has been most especially neglected ; not so much, however, because it was unknown, but because it was supposed to stand in contrast, rather than in contact, with any ordinary form of speech. Even the German affinities have been introduced as something requiring more than ordinary evidence, so decided has been the tendency to oppose rather than reconcile the two leading populations of Western Europe. The Latin aspect only has been fairly studied; and here how little has been done in an eminently promising field !

There is no error without its explanation. The pretermission of the Fin and Basque comparisons is easily accounted for. According to the ordinary views of the so-called Indo-European group, they belonged to a wholly different division; in which case everything within the Indo-European pale was to be exhausted before either of the languages in question was resorted to. What, however, if the Keltic were an outlying member of its class, and the Basque and Fin were the tongues through which it came in contact with the languages of the rest of the world ? In such a case they would be in a relation better understood by the naturalist than the philologue, a relation which the diagrams of the zoologist and botanist may conveniently be made to illustrate—the relation of an *osculant* group.

Such is, most probably, the case. If not—if the Fin and Basque be not the nearest approaches to the Keltic, after the languages of the German, Sarmatian, and classical stocks, there has been displacement and intrusion, and one of the three languages is not *in situ*. The original *situs*, however, being ascertained, either the philological affinities will be those suggested by the geographical relations, or a phenomenon of extreme rarity will be presented. This is what common sense tells us to expect. This is what the wide and careful induction from the distribution of existing languages confirms.

FINIS.